

Bela Kun: May First and the United Front
W. Z. Foster: The Labor Party Question
Piatnitsky on the International Situation


WORKERS OF THE WORLD,
UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



No.
12

Price
10c

NEW  **INTERNATIONAL** BOOKS

Communism in the United States

By **EARL BROWDER**

The General Secretary of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. analyzes the present situation, discusses the N.R.A., recent strike struggles, offers a critique of current political programs; examines the present situation in and policies of the Socialist Party; discusses the program and tactics of the united front against war and fascism, and presents the Communist position with regard to the vital questions of the day.

352 Pages—Cloth—\$2.00

The Revolution of 1905-1907

By **V. I. LENIN**

SELECTED WORKS, VOLUME III

From the very prolific literary work of Lenin during the period of the first Russian Revolution, selections have been made for this volume which give a fundamental picture of the character, moving forces and prospects of the Revolution which Lenin called the "dress rehearsal for 1917".

Cloth—\$2.00

The Years of Reaction and the Revival of the Movement (1908-1914)

By **V. I. LENIN**

SELECTED WORKS, VOLUME IV

This volume is divided into the following parts: I. The Period of Reaction, 1908-1911. II. The Period of Revival, 1912-1914. III. The Agrarian and Peasant Question. IV. The National Question. V. Questions of the International Revolutionary Movement Up to the World War.

Cloth—\$2.00

Fascism—Make or Break?

By **R. BRAUN**

The real results of fascism in regard to the masses of the population and economic conditions are described in this well-documented record of the German experience since the June purge. The latest developments on the international arena are linked up with the basic policy of German fascism.

Cloth—\$1.00

Order from your nearest bookshop or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published twice a month in English, Russian, German, French,
Chinese and Spanish

VOL. XII JUNE 20, 1935 No. 12

CONTENTS

MAY FIRST AND THE UNITED FRONT 687

By BELA KUN

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION 699

By O. PIATNITSKY

THE DERBY CONFERENCE OF THE INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY . 716

By HARRY POLLITT

DISCUSSION FOR THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE C.I.

THE NEW POLITICAL BASES FOR A LABOR PARTY IN THE UNITED
STATES 731

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

IN THE SOVIET UNION

THE ECONOMIC PLAN OF THE U.S.S.R. FOR THE YEAR 1935 . . . 742

By A. WITTENBURG

BOOK REVIEW

LENIN ON FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY AND EQUALITY 754

By D.

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, P. O. Box 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year, \$2; six months, \$1; single copies, 10 cents

In No. 13 of

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

1. In Memoriam A. S. Martynov.
2. An Interview with Comrade Stalin in 1920.
3. The Lessons of the Elections in France and Czechoslovakia.
4. Fascist Plans to "Localize" War and the Revolutionary Struggle for Peace.
5. Release Comrade Antikainen!

TOWARD THE SEVENTH CONGRESS

6. *J. Lensky*: The Communist Party of Poland Between the Sixth and Seventh Congresses.

DISCUSSION FOR THE SEVENTH CONGRESS

7. *B. Sherman*: Regarding Some Questions of Agrarian Work in the U.S.A.
8. *K. Roncoli*: The Communist Party of Italy Must Come Out of Its Deep Underground Position.

PROBLEMS OF PARTY STRUCTURE

9. For the Unity of the Communist Party of Japan.

REVIEW OF THE PRESS

10. The Press of the Communist Parties of France, Czechoslovakia and England.

BOOK REVIEW

11. *W. Rust*: If Maxton Were a Dictator.

●
Make sure you get every issue

Subscribe Now

\$2 PER YEAR

\$1 FOR SIX MONTHS

Our aim is 8,000 copies sold by the time of the
Seventh World Congress.

●
Send your subscription to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

May First and the United Front

(Preliminary Results)

By BELA KUN

THE International Federation of Trade Unions (Amsterdam International) gave a decided refusal to the proposal of the Profintern for joint action on May First. The Labor and Socialist International (Second International) not so vulgarly but none the less decisively turned down the proposal of the Communist International to organize joint May First demonstrations. The Socialist Workers' Sports International (Lucerne International), in its letter dated April 16, 1935, turned down the proposal of the Red Sports' International to organize joint May First demonstrations by working class sportsmen, explaining its refusal by the statement that it allegedly could not in such a short time find out the opinion of its national sections on this question.

As is well known, according to the decision of the session of the Bureau of the Executive Committee of the Second International held in November last year, the National Councils of the Socialist Parties are given the right to conclude agreements regarding the united front with the Communist Parties. But apart from the Italian Social-Democrats and the "Revolutionary Socialists" in Austria, the leading bodies of all the Social-Democratic Parties turned down the proposals made by the Communist Parties regarding the organization of joint May First demonstrations.

The Administrative Commission of the Socialist Party of France, after a discussion, turned down the idea of the joint issue of a First of May Manifesto. According to the opinion of the Administrative Commission, a decision to the contrary would not correspond to the spirit of the last session of the National Council of the Socialist Party.

The Social-Democratic Party of Holland, whose leader, I. V. Alboard, was put forward by the Right Social-Democrats as candidate for the position of Chairman of the Second International, declared in reply to the proposal made by the C.P. of Holland that "we shall have no cooperation with our mortal enemies! What sort of a doll's comedy is this! To think of making such a proposal three weeks prior to the First of May, when we have already made all our preparations for the May First holiday. This is perfect trickery!"

Certain Social-Democratic committees at the center and in the districts considered it more advisable not to reply to the united front proposals made by the Communists.

And yet, in spite of all, there were joint demonstrations held on May First!

In spite of all, the united front, which was turned down on an international and national scale, made its way, on May First, into many factories, towns, villages and entire districts. Groups of Social-Democratic workers, masses of rank-and-file members and even entire Social-Democratic organizations and reformist trade unions demonstrated in

many towns and districts on May First, along with the Communist Party organizations and revolutionary trade unions. The Social-Democratic workers who joined the united front and marched shoulder to shoulder with the Communists grasped the meaning of "the cunning mechanism of the two fronts" (Lenin), and understood that in politics there are only the two fronts of the two basic classes in capitalist society, namely, the working class front and the capitalist class front. They understood that every proletarian must become part of the working class front, so as not to allow himself to be utilized in the interests of the capitalist exploiters by intensifying the split in the ranks of the working class.

As compared with the May First demonstrations held a year ago, May First, 1935, displayed an increasing urge on the part of very wide masses for the united front, and an increase in the number of joint May First actions.

As in all questions of the united front at the present historical moment, so on May First of this year the urge of the working class towards united action was most powerfully expressed in France. Therefore, it is there that the First of May demonstrations show more clearly than ever how great could be the scope assumed by the working class struggle both in France and throughout the world, if it were possible, by the joint efforts of the Communist and Social-Democratic workers, to sweep out of the way all the efforts made to resist and sabotage united action.

If we are to judge from the newspaper reports in the Communist, Social-Democratic and bourgeois press, the First of May demonstrations in the provinces assumed an even greater scope than in Paris itself, especially if we take into account the power of the proletariat of Paris. The most powerful and moving demonstration on May First took place in Marseilles. The central organ of the French Socialist Party, the *Populaire*, dated May 2, gives the following interesting description of this demonstration:

"On May First tramway traffic was completely at a standstill, a fact which introduced certain confusion into the life of the city. In addition to which the bus traffic which serves various lines in the different districts was at a standstill. The dock workers decided to participate in the big demonstration arranged for the morning of May First, and as a result not a single ship left the harbor. Only guards were on duty on board. All work came to a standstill on the dockside. Street cleaners and dustmen wholeheartedly participated in the celebrations. No trading took place in the central market. All the workers' organizations came together at 9 o'clock on the big square by the exchange. This is the first demonstration organized in Marseilles since the trade unions were split. All municipal enterprises in the districts were completely held up by the strike. The strike was carried on so solidly that the municipal buildings were closed. At the Custom House and slaughter houses, and on the canals, everybody was drawn into the strike."

This is the report of the *Populaire* which keeps completely silent about the fact that the demonstrations in France assumed the character

of united front actions. Such united front demonstrations took place on May First in almost all provincial towns in France.

According to preliminary estimates, joint demonstrations took place in 63 towns, including Lille, Marseilles, St. Etienne, Mulhouse, etc., in all covering 165,000 people. All these demonstrations show that joint action by the Communist and Social-Democratic workers and organizations and by members of the reformist and revolutionary unions could draw in their train the unorganized proletarians, the workers, many of whom have hitherto stood apart from the class struggle. Whereas the strike movement in Paris was not on a wider scale than the strikes that took place in the First of May of last year, the strike movement in the provinces, on the contrary, as the *Times* correspondent reported, developed on an incomparably wider scale than in 1934, a point which can only be explained by the fact that in Paris the leaders of the reformist General Confederation of Labor and of the Socialist Party succeeded to a considerable degree in undermining joint demonstrations by the workers in spite of the very powerful urge of the workers for joint action. In the provinces, however, the workers by their revolutionary action smashed this resistance from the top.

Some of the blatant enemies of the united front, from their own experience, learned the meaning of this decisive pressure exerted by the masses, and not the least among these was the leader of the reformist trade unions, Jouhaux, who spoke in the mining center of Lens. In connection with the speech made by Jouhaux, the *Populaire* reported that "May First passed off quietly in Lens". According to the information of *l'Humanite*, however, at the meeting specially organized by the reformist trade unions so as to spoil the joint First of May demonstration, Jouhaux had an audience of only 350 people, whereas 4,000 workers took part in the united front demonstration.

In the Scandinavian countries, the influence of the united front was also expressed in the power and scope of the First of May demonstrations. This state of things is all the more important in that in all the agitation of the Second International, the northern countries, which are ruled by Social-Democratic governments, are represented as operating Socialist ideas, and are utilized as a crushing argument against unity of action.

The leaders of the ruling Social-Democratic Party in Sweden, from the height of their greatness, turned down the united front proposals connected with May First. In the same way these proposals were turned down by the Socialist Party which supports the government although it is allegedly in "opposition" to it.

In Goteborg, however, the second largest city in Sweden, the local committee of the Socialist Party called on its members to participate in joint demonstrations with the Communists on May First. Judging by the number of people who took part in this demonstration, it was a far bigger one than all the demonstrations held in the past. In the northern industrial center, Kiruna, in Gagnef, and also in a number of other localities such as Bolnes, Gudsmo, Hudigsva, etc., there were big joint demonstrations.

In Norway, where the bourgeoisie have also entrusted the manage-

ment of their affairs to a Social-Democratic government, a united front demonstration took place on May First in Bergen, the second largest city in the country. The local press, both Communist and Social-Democratic, are unanimous in their report that 15,000 people took part in this demonstration. This was the biggest demonstration ever seen in Bergen. Apart from this, there were joint demonstrations in many big industrial centers, such as Haugesund, Poorsgrund, etc.

In Switzerland, although the Social-Democrats turned down the united front proposals made by the Communists, the local organization of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties prepared and held a joint May First demonstration in Basle, the second largest town in the country, which is at the same time the largest industrial center in Switzerland. A number of similar joint demonstrations took place in other towns in Switzerland.

In the U.S.A. the First of May demonstrations this year assumed a scope unheard of in the history of the American working class movement. It is true that in New York the columns of the Communist and Social-Democrats marched separately, since the Social-Democratic leaders declared against a united demonstration (in each procession there were from 50,000 to 60,000 demonstrators). A large section of Social-Democratic workers in New York acted against the wishes of their leaders and took part in the meeting held by the Communists in Union Square.

Thus, in a number of capitalist countries, May First showed a growing striving and preparedness on the part of the Social-Democratic workers to undertake a common struggle against the common class enemy. This was especially made clear in some of the May First demonstrations that took place in Czechoslovakia. There, as a result of the stubborn resistance of the leading body of the Social-Democratic Parties, the First of May demonstrations in general took place separately. What is characteristic is an incident that took place, for instance, in Prague. The Social-Democratic workers who had gathered together at their own meeting heard that fascist groups had in different parts of the town taken the liberty of making brazen provocative attacks on workers participating in the Communist demonstration. Then hundreds of Social-Democratic workers dashed off to the street where they could, along with the Communists, beat off the fascist provocateurs. Three groups of members of the Young Socialist organization followed this example of the adult Social-Democratic workers and joined in the Communist demonstration with their banners and posters.

As a rule the Social-Democratic press has kept silent about the united front demonstrations and militant actions. And not without cause. For the majority of these united front demonstrations took place in spite of the negative attitude taken by the leading Social-Democratic bodies, and were in violation of the discipline of the Social-Democratic Party.

Another sign of the success of united proletarian action is the fact that the slogans of the Comintern and those of various Communist Parties penetrated into the ranks of the Social-Democratic demonstrations. The slogan of the defense of the U.S.S.R. against the danger of

an imperialist counter-revolutionary war was especially to be met with on a wide scale among the Social-Democratic workers. According to the reports of the *Peuple*, the central organ of the Belgian Socialist Party, it was not noticeable that those who participated in the Social-Democratic demonstrations were especially enthusiastic about the entry of the Social-Democratic leaders into the Belgian government. The *Peuple* records loud applause on only two occasions during the course of speeches made, namely, when Brandfaute spoke about the forthcoming recognition of the U.S.S.R. by Belgium, and once, while Vandervelde was speaking, of which the *Peuple* reports stated the following:

"When Vandervelde at the end of his speech said that in the course of a year the recognition of the U.S.S.R. would be an accomplished fact, there was loud applause."

Such facts, dozens more of which could be quoted, and also examples of the united front in the most important European and other seaports such as Marseilles, Goteborg, Bergen and New York, *show how great are the possibilities for establishing unity of action between the decisive sections of the working class, especially in the seaports which are so important as regards holding up the transport of munitions, etc., in case of war.*

The united front is driving its way forward! Unity of action can and must be extended and consolidated. This is one of the most important results of the First of May review of the forces of the proletariat this year.

EXCUSES REGARDING THE UNITED FRONT

The reactionary elements in the ranks of international Social-Democracy are carrying on their struggle against the united front. How these leaders are pinned up against the wall is shown by the very development of the arguments used by the Executive Committee of the Second International against the united front, beginning with their rejection of the proposals made by the Communist Party regarding the joint struggle against Hitlerite fascism (March 1933), and ending with their latest rejection of the joint organization of the international review of the forces of the proletariat on May First.

No less characteristic of the confused situation into which the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders have fallen are the contradictions in the arguments given in the refusal put forward by the three international Social-Democratic centers, namely, the Second International, the Amsterdam Trade Union International and the Reformist Sports' International. The Secretariat of the Second International in reply to the proposal made by the Executive Committee of the Communist International regarding the joint organization of First of May demonstrations, in their refusal, dated April 15, used the following argument:

"According to the decision of the Executive Committee of the Socialist Workers' International, reported to you in our letter to Cashin and Thorez on November 17, 1934, there can be no doubt that the question of the possibility of joint action

in connection with the celebration of May First is left to the decision of the Socialist Party in each separate country."

The letter of the Executive Committee of the Second International, dated November 17, 1934, to which the Secretariat now refers, contained the rejection of the proposal made by the Executive Committee of the Communist International regarding the establishment of the united front of the international proletariat to render assistance to the Spanish proletariat. At the same meeting, the Executive Committee of the Second International annulled one of its previous decisions against the united front which insistently proposed to the parties of the Second International that *they must not conclude any agreements with the Communist Parties for struggle against Hitlerite fascism*. Let us quote the most important section of this resolution, now annulled, of the Second International, which immediately after Hitler came to power disrupted the establishment of international united front action against the fascist terror in Germany and other countries.

"The Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International declared that only negotiations between the two internationals as such can lead to any real and honest agreement regarding joint action against capitalist reaction."

At the Paris session of the Executive Committee of the Second International held on November 13-16, 1934, this decision was annulled for the following reasons:

"Since that time [i.e., since the time when the united front on an international scale against Hitler was rejected—Ed. Board], however, new events have taken place, especially in Austria, which have stimulated the various sections of the Labor and Socialist International to conclude united front agreements on their own initiative, taking into account the different situations in the various countries. . . . Under such circumstances the position on this questions recommended in the resolution of March 18 and 19, 1933, has lost its foundation, and each affiliated party is allowed complete independence and freedom of action in this sphere."

And so the Executive Committee of the Second International annulled its general prohibition of the establishment of the united front which was to tie the hands of all its sections, on the grounds that "new events" had taken place, but did so merely to adopt a new decision which once again rejects the most efficient establishment of a broad united front on an international scale. Since that time, however, "new events" have once again taken place, of similar international importance, events which are of tremendous interest for the international proletariat, so that the establishment of unity of action on an international scale, especially in connection with the international review of the forces of the proletariat on the First of May has become an urgent necessity.

The introduction of universal military service in Germany implies the precipitous approach of the danger of a new imperialist war. The fascist leaders of Germany, acting at the behest of German imperialism, threaten the national and state independence of a number of small

European nations, and are attempting by force to draw these countries into the counter-revolutionary front of war against the Soviet Union.

The fascist terror in Germany is aiming at the physical annihilation of all the fighters of the proletariat who are willing and able to organize resistance to the incitement of the Hitler government to imperialist war, to organize the struggle against the oncoming danger of war, and to transform the imperialist war into a civil war. It is no accident that the new wave of fascist terror in Germany has almost coincided with the time when universal military service has been introduced following on the linking up of the Saar region to the Hitler empire.

Are not these events of tremendous international importance? Do not these events urgently dictate the need for bringing about united action on an international scale by the entire international proletariat, and the concentration of the forces of all working class organizations against the main instigators of war, against the German fascists? Would not only every Social-Democratic worker but every non-Party worker enthusiastically greet the establishment of a wide, solid united front on an international scale? And if we could bring this about, would not such a united front be a tremendous stimulus to the further intensification of the heroic, underground, illegal struggle of the revolutionary and all anti-fascist workers in Germany? Would not such unity of action give the heroic revolutionaries in Spain and Austria courage and fortitude for the development of new struggles? Does not the establishment of the united front of the international proletariat imply a tremendous consolidation of the forces of the proletariat in all countries, in their struggle against the capitalist offensive, fascism and the war danger?

The First of May demonstrations this year, as the examples of the growing movement for the united front and the growing popularity of the slogan of the defense of the Soviet Union have shown, prove that the Comintern made no mistake when the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. declared, in connection with the rejection of the united front by the Second International, that members of the Social-Democratic Parties and the broad masses of the struggling proletariat have welcomed the proposals of the C.I. for the organization of joint May Day demonstrations. But the Social-Democratic workers must remember: the L.S.I. first made joint action by Communists and Social-Democrats, even on a national scale, dependent on an agreement between the two Internationals. Then it rejected the fresh proposals made by the C.I. for international action, on the grounds that joint action could only be organized by means of agreements between the individual national parties affiliated to the L.S.I. and the C.I. Confronted by these contradictory declarations on the question of the establishment of international unity of action, the workers will ask in astonishment: "When will the moment come which the L.S.I. deems suitable for giving its approval to united international action on the part of the proletariat?"

The full importance of this rejection by the Second International of united action on an international scale will become clear to the Social-Democratic workers if they bear in mind that even the sharpening of the war danger and the unheard-of fascist terror in Germany, directed

against the Communist, Social-Democratic and Christian workers, failed to move the leaders of the Second International to agree to undertake joint action. The leaders of the Second International have rejected joint action which was to be directed in the first case towards the struggle for the preservation of peace and against the unbridled fascist bandits in Germany, who are literally wiping out the best sons of the working class in the interests of the war policy of Hitler Germany.

When the Second and Two-And-A-Half Internationals united at the Hamburg Conference, the delegates of the Social-Democratic Parties represented there, taking into account the collapse of the Second International on August 4, 1914, deemed it necessary to stress that "the Labor and Socialist International is a weapon for the fulfilment of its tasks not only in peace time, but is also absolutely necessary weapon during the period of any war whatsoever".

In the present situation which is heavy with war, and when the fate of the world hangs by a thread which the German fascist leaders and Kaiser Wilhelm's generals may break at any moment, in such a situation when even Vandervelde himself in his speech over the radio delivered on May 1, 1935, had to recognize that the war danger has become exceptionally sharp, this same Vandervelde immediately declared in the same speech that:

"We cannot but take note here that in the given state of affairs the possibility of international action by the workers has been reduced to a minimum."

The Social-Democratic workers must set themselves the question as to what will happen when this state of affairs under which, according to Vandervelde, "the possibility of international working class action has been reduced to a minimum", becomes transformed into a "war situation". Judging by the words uttered by Vandervelde, should such a war situation come about, there will once again be no possibility of organizing international working class action just as, according to the Second International, there was no such possibility in 1914.

The existence of the Communist International is a guarantee that in the event of a new August 4, 1914, repeating itself, wide mass protest action on the part of the working class will be developed. But to ensure that the international proletariat may be able now, before it is too late, to develop a wide and successful struggle to hinder the unleashing of war by the German fascists, their allies and their masters behind the scenes, and to prevent the outbreak of a new imperialist war, it is absolutely essential that a struggle be carried on to establish the united front of the Communist and Social-Democratic organizations on a national and international scale.

We have already given documentary proof to show that the leaders of the Second International seek on each occasion for ever new methods and excuses for breaking international unity of action.

The point of view now of the leaders of the Second International may be reduced to the following: the united front may be tolerated only in so far as the leaders of the various sections of the Second International cannot annul it. But the Second International as a whole must

not be burdened with the united front, even if it is necessary for the struggle against the extremely sharp danger of war, and even against the murderous terror of the fascist hangmen.

The International Federation of Trade Unions, which was most sharp in its rejection of the united front proposals made by the Profintern, does not even wish to tolerate the thought of any kind of unity of action. In its reply to the Profintern, the Bureau of the Amsterdam International rejected the united front on the First of May on the following grounds:

"The attitude of the International Federation of Trade Unions towards the Communists' proposals for unity of action, a united front or a common front was so often established and confirmed by the decisions of the Congress and of the General Council, including the recent decisions made in Weymouth, on August 29, 1934, that it may be considered that this attitude is sufficiently known to the workers' trade union organizations of the world."

In any case, if there are working class organizations that are still unacquainted with these decisions, we may inform them that all these decisions very strictly forbid reformist unions and their members from carrying on a joint struggle along with members and organizations of the revolutionary unions. What is more, according to the opinion of the Amsterdam International, joint struggle may only be tolerated if the revolutionary trade unions unconditionally dissolve into the reformist trade union organizations, and declare their readiness to give up the revolutionary struggle, and make the principle of class collaboration the basis of their trade union tactics.

The Socialist Workers' Sports International in its letter dated April 16, in reply to the proposal made by the Red Sports International that they should conclude an agreement to organize joint demonstrations on May First, declared as follows:

"The E.C. of the W.S.I. at its meeting held on April 16, discussed your letter dated April 12. Our E.C. is as hitherto of the opinion that the merging of the two working class sports internationals into a single organization is not the correct path to bring about the unification of worker sportsmen with a view to joint struggle against war and fascism. Our E.C. is of the opinion that not the unification of the organizations at the top, but joint mass action will lay the foundations for our joint struggle."

In conclusion, in regard to the proposals for joint demonstrations to be held on May First, the reformist sport international declared that:

"We consider it as hardly likely that our organizations in the different countries could give such a sufficiently speedy reply [to the question regarding the possibility of joint action by working class sportsmen on May First—*Ed. Board*] as to enable both workers' sports internationals to come to an agreement prior to May First."

The Chairman of the reformist workers' sports international, Julius Deutsch, and his secretary, Ernest Silaha, turned out to be good prophets. Their prophesies came to pass. The reformist sports organizations actually did not give any reply, so that no joint action by working class sportsmen took place on May First.

It is not without interest to compare all these excuses and evasions used by the leaders of the three most powerful international Social-Democratic and reformist organizations in their efforts to avoid joint demonstrations on May First.

The Second International did not in principle exclude the possibility of joint mass First of May demonstrations being held in different countries, without the preliminary organizational unification of the Social-Democratic and Communist Parties. But joint action by the Communist International and the Labor and Socialist International, even in the shape of the issue of a humble manifesto, *was decisively turned down by the Second International, without any negotiations whatsoever.*

The Amsterdam International rejected in principle the idea of any joint demonstrations by the revolutionary and reformist organizations on May First, and set as a preliminary condition for any joint action, the organizational unification of the trade unions.

The Lucerne Workers' Sports International, on the contrary, did not wish to entertain any idea of organizational unification with the revolutionary worker sportsmen, an object which the Red Sports Organizations are striving for, but in principle declared in favor of joint action by the masses.

In practice these contradictory arguments of the three reformist internationals undermined the establishment of the united front of the international proletariat on the First of May. But these decisions, it is clear, also influenced the position of the various national sections of these three internationals. And because of this, joint May Day demonstrations still took place, not thanks to, but *in spite* of the position taken up by the three reformist internationals, and in the majority of cases, in spite of the decision of the leading bodies of their national sections. These preliminary successes of the united front provide a lesson not only for the Communist Parties and their members, but also for the Social-Democratic Parties, not only for the revolutionary but also for the reformist trade unions and their supporters, and not only for the revolutionary sports organizations and their members, but also for the reformist sportsmen.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE UNITED FRONT CONTINUES

The Communist International and the Communist Parties continue insistently to make proposals for united front action, not for the purpose of registering ever new facts of the rejection of the united front by the leaders of the Second International and the leading bodies of the Social-Democratic Parties in the different countries. No rejections by the Social-Democratic leaders and the leading bodies of the Socialist Parties will confound the Comintern and its sections, and compel them to weaken their struggle for unity of action.

The tactics of the united proletarian front are the basis for the establishment of the workers' class front against capitalism, for counterposing the united forces of the proletariat against the forces of the capitalists in the struggle against the capitalist offensive, against fascism, against the danger of imperialist war, for improving the standard of living of the working class, for the preservation of peace, and in defense of the Soviet Union.

The Communists will not depart from these tactics in spite of all the efforts of the Social-Democratic leaders and the enemies of the united front to hinder them, and in spite of all excuses made. The Communists will not depart from their tactics all the more since the proletarian united front, united action, is the method whereby the widest masses of the workers are led to the decisive revolutionary struggles to liberate the toilers and all those who are oppressed and exploited.

Will it be possible to achieve agreement on an international scale and on a national scale as in France, Austria and Italy? This problem will be solved in the process of the class struggle itself, and depends in the first instance, on the struggle carried on by the Communist Parties, on their ability to win the masses of Social-Democratic and reformist workers by patient, comradely and convincing discussion, and by cooperation with them in militant united front action.

But whether we achieve success in this connection also depends on the workers organized in the Social-Democratic Parties and reformist organizations, on the determination of their active workers and organizations.

May First has shown that in the majority of countries the pressure of the masses of the workers on the Right, especially on the leading Social-Democratic officials, is growing. It depends on the determination and the extent of the pressure from below whether it will be possible in France by August First, the international day of struggle against the danger of imperialist war, or in connection with any other ominous event, or even in connection with May First next year, to stimulate the leaders of the French Socialist Party to make a joint appeal with the Communist Party of France, to the French proletariat to undertake mass demonstrations of Social-Democratic and Communist workers and their organizations. For this reason, therefore, in the interest of establishing and further developing unity of action, it is essential that an increase in the pressure of the masses of Social-Democratic workers on their Social-Democratic reformist leading bodies be brought about. To a still greater degree, what is required is that pressure be exerted by the Social-Democratic and Communist workers in those countries where the Social-Democratic leaders consider the Communists as their "mortal enemies", as for instance, in Holland, in the Scandinavian countries. It is only if such pressure is exerted that we shall succeed to a greater extent than hitherto in developing the struggle for the united front. The position is similar in Great Britain where the Labor Party is once again preparing to undertake the management of the affairs of the British bourgeoisie, after the example of the Social-Democrats in Belgium and the Scandinavian countries.

In Belgium and Czechoslovakia where the Social-Democratic Parties

are participating in the government, i.e., are managing the affairs of the capitalists of their own countries, we also need much greater effort on the part of the Social-Democratic and Communist workers to break down the resistance to the united front.

The majority of the members of the Prague C.C. of the German Social-Democratic Party are openly endeavoring, by assisting in carrying through the imperialist war policy of Hitler Germany, to pave the way for their participation in the dictatorship of capital, when it changes its outward form. It is all the more necessary in Germany to bring about far closer contacts with the Left members, groups and officials of the Social-Democratic Party, and to give a live example of the united front, as for example, in Middle Germany and in South Baden, and to intensify the pressure on the Prague C.C.

It is only by utilizing Bolshevik flexibility in policy and in the sphere of organization, persistent propaganda and agitation, by concretely consolidating the smallest successes in the struggle for the united front, by courage in action, and by firmness and patience in explaining questions of the united front to the Social-Democratic and reformist workers, that we shall succeed in organizing a broad united front on August 1, 1935, for the struggle against the capitalist offensive, fascism and the danger of imperialist war.

Some Problems of the Present International Situation

By O. PIATNITSKY

PART 2

IV. FASCISM

THE dominant bourgeoisie are increasing their offensive against the workers both economically and politically.

Side by side with the decrease in the material standard of living of the masses of the workers, the workers are being increasingly deprived of their rights and are becoming increasingly enslaved politically. Fascism is rife in a number of countries in Europe.

In Germany, the fascist dictatorship has deprived the working class of the remnants of all its political rights and liberties, won over decades by heavy class struggle, as well as the right to strike, to join trade unions and to conclude collective wage agreements, etc.

A very expressive picture of the rights of the workers in the U.S.A. is provided by the report of the commission appointed at the end of the year 1932 by President Roosevelt, to investigate the conditions in the American automobile industry. "An espionage system exists in the majority of enterprises." "The petty caprices of the foremen determine the fate of many automobile workers." As a representative of the union declared when examined by the commission: "Old and experienced workers are dismissed if they display the slightest signs of their active efforts to organize."

If this is the situation in a bourgeois "democratic" country, then what shall we say about countries where fascist dictatorship holds sway?

FASCISM IN ITALY AND POLAND

In April 1934, the fascist government in Italy, for the fourth time, reduced the wages of workers, office employees, etc., by 12 per cent. Unemployment benefits are being cut down, as is the number of people entitled to receive benefits, in spite of the fact that no small percentage of the wages of those employed are transferred to a fund for unemployment insurance. The peasants are driven off the land if they have nothing with which to pay their rents or debts. The dissatisfaction and wrath of the workers and peasants break out from time to time in isolated, and to a great extent, local actions, which are fiercely suppressed, but for the time being the Italian fascists are not receiving the necessary repulse from the working class.

In Poland, the new constitution which has just been published, and which fundamentally means autocratic rights for the President, completely deprives the masses of the workers of their political rights. The social rights of the workers, provided for in the previous constitution (the eight hour day, the right to social insurance), have been completely

wiped out by the new constitution (in actual fact they have been taken away from the workers long ago). Along with the complete abolition of social insurance, it is also proposed to unify (to merge and to give a fascist character to) all the trade unions.

In spite of the fact that a very big struggle is going on in the Polish bourgeois camp, and that the Pilsudski-ites are losing their mass basis among the petty bourgeoisie, the Pilsudski fascists and the "popular democrats" form a united front when it is a question of the struggle against the working class and against the oppressed nationalities in Poland. It is therefore premature to speak about the serious crisis of Polish fascism, in spite of the fact that the offensive of Polish fascism invariably meets with a powerful repulse from the working class (in recent years there have been two general strikes in Poland).

THE POSITION OF GERMAN FASCISM

German fascism is undoubtedly faced with very serious economic difficulties. For the two years of the fascist dictatorship (1933-34), German exports have declined by 1,500 million marks.

Germany's foreign debts amount to 35,000 million marks, but it has nothing with which to pay these debts. It is aiming at a moratorium, and arbitrarily does not pay its obligations, and this circumstance, along with many others, makes it difficult for it to receive new loans and credits.

The heavy financial situation of fascist Germany does not prevent the big firms from making profits.

In 1932 practically all the trusts showed a deficit, but now they all have profits running into millions. In 1932 Krupps had a deficit of 15 millions, but in 1933-34 they had a profit of two millions. In 1932 Gosch had a deficit of six millions, but in 1933 had a profit of one million. In 1932 the Dresden Bank had a deficit of 9.5 millions, but in 1933 had 11.6 millions profit. The Bemberg artificial silk company had a deficit of 5,324,000 in 1932, but a profit of 7,056,000 in 1933.

There is no need to prove that the profits shown in the balance sheets are much lower than the real figures, so as to conceal from the masses the fact that a handful of monopolists are getting rich while the poverty and privations of the masses are growing. The struggle among the various groups of the big bourgeoisie for the division of these profits is growing more intense.

Strong dissatisfaction with the fascists is increasing among the petty bourgeoisie, because the former have not fulfilled their promises.

Last year, the conflicts in the fascist camp grew so sharp that on June 30, 1934, one group of fascist leaders—Hitler, Goering and Goebbels—shot another group of leaders.

Hitler and Goering, in this connection, carried out the orders of the big bourgeoisie, who demanded an end to social demagoguery, *i.e.*, that the fascists put an end to their promise that they would put a limit to "interest slavery", *i.e.*, they would abolish or restrict the activity of the banks, and cut down the profits of the capitalists in the interests of the "nation", etc. The fascist demagogues had promised to exempt the

petty bourgeoisie from taxation, to destroy the cooperative societies which were competing with the small traders, and to close the big stores or even to divide their property among the small traders.

The fascists, of course, did not carry out all these promises, and did not even intend to do so. They tried and are still trying by the use of this demagogy to trick the masses of the petty bourgeoisie. But the petty bourgeoisie, who had come into the movement as the result of the lavish promises made by the fascists before they came to power, began to exert pressure and demand that the promises be carried out. The storm troop detachments that consisted of people of petty bourgeois origin had taken up a very sympathetic attitude to and had taken seriously these fascist slogans which were directed against the big bourgeoisie. Among them, discontent and unrest increased in proportion as fascism displayed itself as the open dictatorship of the big monopolists. Such a situation became dangerous for the real masters of the fascist regime, *i.e.*, for the powerful trusts and banks. They therefore demanded the disarming and disbandment of the storm troops. The carrying out of this demand was accompanied by the murder of a number of fascist leaders who were opposed to the disbandment of the storm troops. Then followed the "cleansing" and disarming of the storm troops.

But when the storm troopers who were connected with the petty bourgeoisie were disarmed, while the promise to exempt the petty bourgeoisie from taxes for 1934 was not kept, though the taxes on the big bourgeoisie were lowered, disillusionment with fascism began to grow stronger among a section of the petty bourgeoisie, and the petty bourgeois basis of fascism began to contract.

The fact that the anti-imperialist demagogy of the fascists is on the ebb does not by any means signify that fascism refuses in individual cases to appear in the role of the "defender of the downtrodden". For example, some time after the events of June 30, the fascists began to make a big noise about a certain house-owner Schmidt who had evicted a worker from his house. It need not be said that such evictions in fascist Germany are a common occurrence. Hundreds and thousands of the unemployed are thrown out of their houses every day, and the entire legal press says nothing about these cases. But on this occasion the fascists developed a big campaign. The papers began to demand the arrest of Schmidt. He was arrested. A great fuss was conducted around him with a view to creating the impression that the fascist government is really anxious to guard the toilers from exploitation and oppression.

But the *chauvinist demagogy of the fascists* is of a particularly frantic type. We know to what a degree the fascists were able to inflame chauvinist passions in connection with the plebiscite in the Saar.

Before the war, as is well known, the Saar district belonged to Germany. After the war it was temporarily made into a separate state under the control of the League of Nations. The coal mines of the Saar were given to France. At the expiration of 15 years the fate of the Saar was to be determined by a plebiscite in which the voters could vote either for the return of the Saar to Germany, or for its union with France, or for the status quo. In order to make the workers more disposed to vote for the union of the Saar district to Germany, the

fascists did everything possible to inflame the chauvinist sentiments of the population, and in particular the German managers of the biggest factories in the Saar displayed unexpected "generosity". To create the impression that the German fascist regime was very anxious about the needs of the workers, the German fascists long before the plebiscite granted millions to pay relief to needy workers in the coal mines and metallurgical plants.

As you are aware, 90.3 per cent of the population of the Saar voted for unity with Germany.

THE RESERVES OF GERMAN FASCISM

The success in the Saar was capably used by the German fascists to further inflame chauvinism in Germany.

Two months later—to a considerable degree with a view to freshening and supplementing the source of inspiration of orgies of nationalist passions, but mainly with the object of fulfilling the imperialist program of the fascists—the government of the fascist dictatorship exerted every effort and increased its armaments, and officially announced the introduction of general conscription in Germany, *i.e.*, the open violation of the Versailles Treaty.

The fact that the government openly violated the Versailles Treaty, by issuing a program of militant imperialism, raised the spirits of a section of the nationalist petty bourgeoisie and particularly of the youth, whose heads had already been turned by the success in the Saar.

They were intoxicated by the fact that Germany was at last entering the ranks of the great powers, obtaining equal rights with other countries in respect to armaments. It is true that this "greatness" increases the danger of war. But though that section of the population which experienced the horrors of the imperialist war understand what the war adventurism of fascism is leading to, the other section of the population, particularly the petty bourgeois youth who did not participate in the war, are still strongly affected by chauvinist intoxication. They hope that the war will be victorious and will bring back the days of the old pre-war Germany in which they lived more or less comfortably.

This chauvinist dope naturally makes revolutionary work more difficult in the country.

German fascism has already displayed its complete inability to lead the country out of the quagmire of great economic difficulties in which it is, and to save even the petty bourgeoisie from a further worsening of their conditions. In this respect the petty bourgeoisie are becoming convinced of the falseness of the corresponding promises made by the fascists.

Nevertheless, chauvinism, the influence of which was shown with special force in the Saar and when the introduction of conscription was announced, is the reserve which German fascism uses to strengthen its bankrupt social demagoguery and to consolidate once more its somewhat shaken positions.

At the present stage we cannot as yet speak of a crisis taking place in German fascism,

German fascism, however, cannot get along very long on chauvinism alone. The fascists must somehow or other relieve the unbearable situation of the masses of the petty bourgeoisie, and of course they cannot do this. I do not need to mention that not only have the 15 millions of the German working class refused to go over to the side of fascism, but that the German working class is its irreconcilable enemy. This cannot cause us any doubts whatsoever. This is shown by the work of the heroic German Communist Party precisely after the fascists seized the power.

It is true that the numerical strength of our German Party fell very much after the fascist coup. This is easy to understand, in so far as legal conditions of existence gave place to deeply illegal ones. The Party has at present about 40,000 paying members. There are about 35,000 Communists in concentration camps or abroad, and not less than 25,000 Party members have either temporarily lost contact with the Party organizations or do not pay membership dues owing to unemployment. Thus the Party has now about 100,000 members. This is much less than before the fascist coup. But the influence of the Party over the working class has very much increased. Its authority has risen high. The Social-Democratic groups which exist in Germany and fight against fascism are forming a united front with the Communist Party.

Hatred towards fascism among the working class, among part of the intellectuals, and among part of the petty bourgeoisie, who have left it, is accumulating and intensifying ever more strongly. In the conditions of bloody fascist terror the revolutionary crisis is maturing in Germany. War will naturally accelerate this process. When the workers get rifles and machine guns in their hands, the days of the fascists will be numbered!

THE SITUATION IN SPAIN

Revolution is taking place in Spain. An ever fiercer and bloody struggle is taking place between revolution and counter-revolution, a struggle between the proletariat and the peasants, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie on the other.

In October, 1934, the government provoked the proletariat to premature action, with a view to dealing a death blow at the revolution. When ministers belonging to the fascist-clerical party "Action Populaire" entered the Lerroux government, the workers replied by a general strike, and some of the workers—the Communists and the revolutionary-minded Socialists—began an armed struggle against fascism, in spite of the fact that the armed uprising had not been prepared politically or organizationally. After a stubborn and heroic struggle on the part of the workers, the rising was crushed. Though the bourgeois landlord reactionaries strengthened their positions, the proletariat have not been beaten and continue their struggle against the fascists.

THE FRENCH PROLETARIAT DEFEATS THE FIRST ATTACKS OF FASCISM

In France the fascist gangs are undoubtedly growing. The French proletariat has twice beaten back the attacks of the fascists,

On February 6, 1934, the fascists succeeded in overthrowing the Daladier government, and if the workers had not come into the streets to resist them, it is difficult to say how far the fascist offensive would have gone. The fascists made their second effort on February 6, 1935, but the working class members of the Socialist Party, together with the Communist workers, defeated this attempt by the united front.

In Great Britain our Party is a small one, but on September 9, 1934, it succeeded in bringing 100,000 workers out in a counter demonstration against the fascist rally in London. There were 5,000 in the fascist parade. Although they were guarded by twice that number of police, they lost their heads at the sight of the huge Communist demonstration and were forced to disperse.

Conclusions. We cannot as yet speak of the crisis of fascism, but the lessons learned by the working class from the fascist coups and from their own struggle against fascism have greatly increased the urge for unity among the workers and assist the struggle of the working class in many countries (Austria, Spain, France).

V. WHAT IS NEW IN THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKING CLASS STRUGGLE?

The masses of the people have not arrived at the point where they are ready to storm capitalism, but "the idea of storming capitalism is maturing in the minds of the masses".

The fascist offensive continues. *But the consciousness of the need for revolutionary struggle is growing among the working class.* The reformists had a theory to the effect that strikes were impossible during the crisis. The present economic crisis has thrust aside this theory of the reformists. Never before during crises have there been so many strikes throughout the world as during the present economic crisis, which has developed on the basis of the general crisis of capitalism.

In the course of the first three years of the crisis, 20,900,000 working days were lost during strikes in America, 20,300,000 in England, and 17,000,000 in India. It is a fact that *the proletariat are trying to protect themselves against a reduction of their standard of living, by every means possible including strikes during the crisis.* What is new is that in spite of the colossal unemployment, *the unemployed have not come forward as black-legs during the strikes, they have not been taking the jobs of those on strike. This new phenomenon in the working class movement is of enormous importance.*

In Germany the advent to power of the fascists, and the pogrom campaign of the latter against the organizations of the working class caused great alarm among the workers of all countries, and undoubtedly, made their resistance to fascism more active. The Austrian Social-Democratic workers, the Schutzbundlers, undertook an armed struggle against fascism, although they had avoided even strikes prior to the open onslaught made by the fascists. There is also something new in the fact that in Spain the workers—members of the Socialist Party—with arms in their hands fought side by side with the Communists, against the advance of fascism and the bourgeois-landlord reaction.

Without these serious, bloody lessons that the workers of all coun-

tries learned when they saw the outcome of the capitulation of German Social-Democracy before fascism, such tremendous demonstrations and strikes as those that took place in France on February 9 and 12, 1934, would not have been possible. Four million workers took part in the strike. This shows that the French proletariat were already well aware of how great was the danger represented by fascism and by capitulation to it.

Had the Austrian and German events not taken place, it is possible that a section of the English workers, whom in general it is somewhat difficult to rouse, would never have taken part in the demonstrations against fascism organized on a united front basis, whereas now, tens of thousands of workers attend these demonstrations, despite the fact that the Laborites and the trade union bureaucrats forbid any participation in them. The German events influenced the working class movement in America: the big strikes which took place in 1933 and 1934, the joint struggle of the Communists and the workers who support the reformists, the struggle which in some countries to a certain extent took place under the leadership of the Communists. This is what is fundamentally new. After the lessons of the German events, the possibilities for the Communists to carry on a successful struggle to establish a united front have been considerably broadened. It is this that is valuable, important and new.

WHAT IS NEW IN THE COLONIES?

An independent working class movement, one which was not there before, has appeared in the colonies.

If economic struggles took place in the colonies previously, they did so under the leadership of the reformist, national bourgeoisie. Now on the other hand, we can record the textile workers' strike which took place in Bombay in May, 1934, led by the Red Textile Workers' Union. The latter was successful, in the beginning, in drawing the other two Bombay textile workers' unions into the strike. We pointed out above that India occupied the third place in the world during the first three years of the crisis as regards the extent of the strike struggles. This is new, something that did not take place immediately after the war, not to mention the fact that still less did it take place before the war.

Despite the increasing terror, great unrest still continues among the peasantry as well, who are rising against extortionate taxation and usury. In the colonies the peasantry in particular suffer at the hands of the imperialists, landlords and usurers. In India, indebtedness which amounts to a total of 270 million pounds sterling, weighs heavily upon 240 million peasants. The peasantry have to pay from 12 to 36 per cent per year on this indebtedness (*Indian White Book Report of the English Parliamentary Commission, 1934*).

KUOMINTANG CHINA AND SOVIET CHINA

As is well known, a Soviet government has already been set up in one part of China. While the other part of China is governed by the Kuomintang (the Kuomintang is the party of the Chinese bourgeoisie

and landlords and is at the head of the Nanking government, formally the central government of China).

In Kuomintang China there are constant strikes against the worsening of the conditions of the workers which are sufficiently bad as it is. The strikes take place in extremely hard circumstances for the proletariat. In the big towns in China, there are not only the Kuomintang police, but the police on the foreign concessions; and the most important factories are situated in the English, French and Japanese concession areas. This being the case, the strikes are invariably accompanied by conflicts with the police, and there are not infrequent cases of the strikers seizing Kuomintang institutions and raiding them and disarming the gendarmes.

As we know, Soviet China covers several districts already. The Chinese Red Army has its political departments, its Young Communist and Party organizations, etc. Of the rank and file in the units which form the main forces of the Chinese Red Army, 52 per cent are from the Young Communist League and from the Party.

Not so long ago the chief Soviet region was in the province of Kiangsi (the Central Soviet Region). Here the land was taken from the landlords and transferred to the peasants, the eight hour day was established by law (the average working day in Kuomintang China is not less than 11 hours), schools and clubs were founded, the Young Communist League and Pioneer detachments were organized, work was being conducted among women. The Chinese peasants for the first time in their lives saw that life was possible without extortionate rents, without the despotism and rapacity of the landlord; they saw that it was possible to have a government of toilers, a Soviet government, distinguished from the government of the generals as the sky is distinct from the earth. A world was created unprecedented in Chinese conditions!

Even now that the troops of Chang Kai-shek have succeeded in driving the main forces of the Red Army out of the Central Soviet Region in Kiangsi, they have not succeeded and will not succeed in exterminating the colossal influence of the Soviet movement there.

The Nanking government tried six times to crush the Central Soviet Region by armed force. Five campaigns met with failure. Only after the sixth campaign, after a year of severe fighting and the use of bombing planes and gases, after roads had been built in order to bring up artillery, and after a whole system of fortifications had been built under the guidance of the German, General Seekt, a well equipped White army, 800,000 strong, drove the Red Army out of the Central Soviet Region. However, its attempt to surround and annihilate the main forces of the Red Army met with complete failure.

The main body of the Red forces broke through the White front, leaving behind in the rear of the enemy leaders for partisan detachments and some regular units. In November, 1934, the Red troops evacuated Kiangsi and passed through several provinces, Kwantung, Kwanksi, Kweichow. In two and a half months, they covered 1,400 kilometers in dismounted formation and engaging in battle. This was indeed a legendary campaign! On their way, they went into battle against the armies of Chiang Kai-shek and routed all the troops of the local generals that

they encountered. (Every province of China has its own army.) They seized towns, replenished their food supplies, collected arms and ammunition, destroyed the documents of the landlords concerning peasant lands, left comrades behind to carry on work for the Young Communists and the Party and for the guerilla warfare detachments, and marched on further. After all these battles, the main forces of the Red Army arrived at Szechwan province.

In Szechwan there is a proletariat. There are salt mines there where about 300,000 workers are engaged. There are oil, coal, ore and cotton. There is an arsenal, guns and airplanes. Szechwan, moreover, is the granary of China. The population there is sixty million.

The Chinese Red Army, whose main forces are now being reorganized, is still faced with a serious struggle, but there is every chance that it will come out victorious.

VI. THE UNITED PROLETARIAN FRONT AND THE FRATERNAL COMMUNIST PARTIES

I will now deal with the last question: what is the idea of the united front tactics and what achievements have been reached through it?

Before the war there was no such term as "united front". The working class organizations, the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions in Western Europe were, on the whole, not split. The struggle between the revolutionary and opportunist tendencies took place inside the Social-Democratic parties.

What is this united front? Actually, the united front means joint action on the part of workers organized in different political and trade union organizations.

Unlike the countries of the West, in former tsarist Russia revolutionary Social-Democracy, on the one hand, and opportunist Social-Democracy, on the other, were organized in different parties. In actual practice, the united front was adopted in Russia, although I do not remember that the term itself was ever used.

Then in Russia, besides the Bolshevik Party of the working class, there were many parties which laid claim to being working class parties and endeavored to gain influence over the working class: the Mensheviks, the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Bundists.

This being the case, joint action was inevitable at definite periods in the struggle against tsarism. And there were actually joint activities of this kind. As for the factories, the workers in them always acted together in a united front, during strikes, without entering into any special agreements.

During big events, demonstrations were sometimes organized jointly. During the armed uprising in Moscow (December, 1905) the call to revolt was signed by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies and the parties represented in the Soviet. In Leningrad (then St. Petersburg) the Soviet of Workers' Deputies was in actual fact an organ of the united front. I, myself, during the 1905 revolution, had to take part in meetings in Odessa together with Bundists, Mensheviks and Socialist Revolu-

tionaries, at which a contact commission was formed to struggle against the pogrom instigators, etc., and which included, besides the organizations already enumerated, representatives of other organizations which at that time were fighting against tsarism. During this period, these organizations in Odessa sometimes arranged joint demonstrations. This was actually a united front.

THE HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE FOR THE UNITED FRONT

After the war when each of the Social-Democratic Parties and the trade unions had openly supported their own bourgeoisie, the formation of revolutionary working class organizations to carry on the class struggle against the bourgeoisie became inevitable. The treacherous policy of the reformists made a split in the working class inevitable. The revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat organized itself into Communist Parties. In consequence of the fact that the trade union bureaucrats began to expell the revolutionary workers and whole organizations from the reformist trade unions, revolutionary trade unions also came into being.

After the war, as soon as the bourgeoisie had recovered from the first revolutionary storms, and began to take back all the gains which the workers had won during that period, the Communist International appealed to the Second International, to all the existing Social-Democratic Parties and workers' organizations, with the proposal to set up a united front of struggle against the capitalist offensive. This was in the autumn of 1921.

In 1922 negotiations were opened. But the conference of three Internationals (the Third, Two-and-a-half and Second) which took place on the question of the united front brought no practical results, for Social-Democracy rudely refused to carry out the obligations it had taken upon itself, and soon afterwards the Second and Two-and-a-half Internationals united on the platform of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and a denial of the revolutionary struggle.

During the period of the relative stabilization of capitalism, the Social-Democratic Parties continued to sink to a still lower level in their policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie. To all the proposals of the Communists for a united front of struggle against the bourgeoisie, they either gave their refusal or gave no reply at all. They continued the same tactics of openly refusing to go into the joint struggle, at the beginning of the crisis.

But the situation changed; the proletariat began to listen more and more to the criticism levelled by the Communists against the Social-Democratic Parties. In many countries the workers—members of Social-Democratic Parties—joined in strikes which were headed by Communists and the revolutionary trade unions. The Social-Democratic leaders were no longer able to limit themselves to merely refusing to join the united front. The situation compelled some of the Social-Democratic Parties to try to solve this problem in a roundabout way and to raise conditions for the united front which they considered totally unacceptable to the Communists. They considered the condition about concluding a pact of

non-aggression (cessation of mutual criticism) between Communists and the Social-Democrats to be a demand of this kind.

In February, 1933, the Second International proposed on its own behalf to the Comintern to conclude a pact of non-aggression on these lines. On March 5, 1933, the Communist International replied that the Communists were prepared to refrain from criticising those Social-Democratic Parties that agree to participate in joint action against the fascists, but only if the Social-Democrats carried on a real struggle against the fascists. If the Social-Democrats failed to fulfill their obligations which the parties take upon themselves concerning joint struggle, then the Communists would criticise them mercilessly and show them up as blacklegs.

On the instructions of the Communist International, all the Communist Parties made proposals to the Socialist Parties to conclude a pact on these lines. But the Social-Democratic Parties rejected the Communist Parties' proposals. It was not the united front they wanted! Since the workers had begun to listen more and more to the criticism made by the Communists, the Social-Democrats merely wanted the Communists to drop their criticism. Of course, the Communist Parties would not agree to this.

But this does not mean that the necessary persistence, flexibility and skill were displayed by several of the Communist Parties and local organizations at that time in the struggle on behalf of the united front, which fact increased the opportunity of the Social-Democratic leaders to get out of our proposals for joint struggle. Several Communist Parties, underestimating the extreme importance of the united front, especially in the face of the fascist offensive, put forward such conditions for concluding a united front, which at times were not sufficiently understood by, or those close to the masses of the, Social-Democratic workers to make them ready either to force their leaders to accept the united front proposals or undertake joint struggles with the Communists over the heads of their own leaders.

Side by side with these mistakes in the work of the Communists, there were other mistakes of quite the opposite kind: readiness to accept any conditions, to cover up the face of the Party, if only they could get formal agreement from the Social-Democratic leaders to undertake joint action. And not always, by a long way, did the Communists carry on broad systematic, persistent agitation among the masses on behalf of their own proposals for a united front.

Both the sectarian and Right mistakes, which greatly hinder the correct struggle for the united front, are being overcome in the practical work of the sections of the Communist International though not without great difficulty and vacillations.

The fascist coup d'état in Germany (January 30, 1933), and the disgraceful capitulation of German Social-Democracy called forth indignation against the latter and a desire for the united front among the working masses.

Before the coup d'état, German Social-Democracy had a membership of one million, had mighty organizations at its disposal, and controlled the trade unions. The state police apparatus of Prussia was in

the hands of its most prominent representatives. It had at its disposal the widest opportunities for struggle against the preparations for the fascist coup d'etat.

The German Communist Party appealed three times to the Social-Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions, proposing that they jointly organize a general strike. This was on July 20, 1932, when the fascists overthrew the Prussian Social-Democratic government, on January 30, when Hitler came to power, and on March 5, 1933, after the burning of the Reichstag.

But the Social-Democratic leaders persistently rejected these proposals.

True, despite the fact that the Social-Democratic leadership and the trade union leaders sabotaged the united front, the united front of Communist and Social-Democratic workers began in several cases—not long before Hitler's advent to power—to be operated from below, in joint demonstrations, defense of workers' clubs, print-shops, newspapers, etc. However, the extent of these joint activities was far from sufficient to mobilize the broad masses of the Social-Democratic workers and the reformist trade unions for the struggle against fascism. At the same time the Social-Democratic Party itself did not even attempt to make use of the enormous forces at its disposal against fascism, and thus paved the way for fascism.

This capitulation to fascism could not fail to cause dissatisfaction among the masses of the rank-and-file members, not only of German Social-Democracy, but in the other parties of the Second International. The growing, immense disillusion in the policy of the Social-Democratic Parties led the masses of their rank-and-file members to begin to listen attentively to the proposals for the united front, and to raise the question in their organizations of united action with the Communists.

THE UNITED FRONT IN FRANCE

I have already mentioned the influence that the lessons of the German events had upon the mass movement of February 9-12, 1934, in France.

On February 7-8, the French Communist Party called upon the proletariat to reply to the fascist demonstrations by coming out on the streets on February 9 all over France. In order to prevent the workers from participating in these demonstrations called by the Communist Party for February 9, the Socialist Party of France appealed to the workers to "down tools" in a general strike on February 12. Without withdrawing its call to demonstrate on February 9, the Communist Party joined in the appeal of the Socialists to call a strike on February 12. But unlike the Socialists, the Communists proposed that on February 12 there should be not a "down tools" strike but a strike combined with demonstrations.

On February 9, the proletariat came out on the streets. It was the first time in France that such huge masses were set in motion by an appeal made by the Communists. Taking into account the influence of this tremendous demonstration and the strike of February 12, in which

about four million workers took part, the anti-fascist congress which took place in Paris a short time after these events, made a proposal, at the instance of the Communists, to the congress of the French Socialist Party which was taking place at that time, to set up a united front.

The leaders of the Socialist Party rejected this proposal.

But this time there was a strong opposition at the Socialist Congress, which reflected the pressure of the masses and demanded that the Socialist Party meet the proposal of the Communists. And although the congress declared that the Socialist Party would not make a permanent united front, it was compelled to decide that the C.C. of the Socialist Party could enter into agreement with the Communist Party on separate questions. The Communist Party of France used this decision to propose that the Socialist Party organize a joint campaign to release Thaelmann. The Socialist Party once more refused.

Then the Communist organization in Paris put the same proposal to the Paris organization of the Socialist Party which, in view of the moods of the Parisian proletariat, decided to enter into a united front. This decision on the part of the Paris organization, the most important in the whole of the Socialist Party, compelled the C.C. of the Socialist Party to enter into negotiations for a united front with the French Communist Party. Thus, agreement was arrived at in France between the Communist Party and the Socialist Party for the united front of struggle against fascism, which has brought such big results. Communists and Socialists have jointly convened big mass meetings and joint demonstrations. This has considerably increased the power of the working class of France to resist the offensive of the fascists, and has had a great influence upon the struggle for the united front in many other countries as well.

THE UNITED FRONT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

In England, the Labor Party (which is affiliated to the Second International) and the leaders of the trade unions are against the united front. But the Communist Party of Great Britain is not infrequently successful in getting a united front with a section of the Labor Party and trade union organizations. A short time ago events of very great importance for England took place on this basis. When the law was passed in Parliament curtailing unemployment benefits by 30-50 per cent, the Communist Party of Great Britain together with the Independent Labor Party and some of the local labor and trade union organizations called the unemployed out in mass demonstrations. The demonstrations of unemployed, which took place partly as a result of this appeal and partly spontaneously, covered all the most important districts of the country and assumed such dimensions that the government was compelled to retreat; the law is at present no longer being operated!

In several towns in Poland—Warsaw, Lodz and others—the Communist Party of Poland has been successful in establishing the united front with local organizations of the Polish Socialist Party and the Bund (the Jewish Social-Democratic Party). Recently in Warsaw a conference of workers took place, which was convened without the Com-

munists. The leaders of the Polish Socialist Party tried to prevent Communists from taking part in it. Nevertheless, the Communists had about 60 delegates at the conference, representatives of whom it was not possible not to include in the governing body of the conference and in the commissions which worked on the resolutions. The Conference passed a decision which contradicts the line of the Polish Socialist Party, namely in defense of the Soviet Union and against the alliance of Poland with Germany. Thus, in Poland as well, the pressure from below (from the masses) is such that it forces the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party to enter the united front in some places.

In the United States of America big strikes have been conducted on the basis of the united front.

In October, 1934, in connection with the armed fighting which had taken place in Spain, the Comintern made a proposal to the Second International for the joint organization of assistance to the Spanish workers—victims of Spanish fascism. The Second International refused to accept the Comintern proposal, but their refusal caused strong dissatisfaction among the members of the reformist trade unions and the Social-Democratic Parties.

The Conference of the Second International which took place soon after also rejected the proposal of the Communist International, but at the same time was compelled to abandon its previous decision prohibiting Social-Democratic Parties in individual cases from concluding separate united front agreements with the Communists. The Conference decided to grant the Social-Democratic Parties the right to conclude agreements for a united front with the Communists on their own responsibility.

At this conference the representatives of six parties, among them the French Socialist Party, the Spanish, Italian, Swiss and Austrian Social-Democratic Parties and the Polish Bund, voted in favor of joint action in defense of the Spanish workers, as proposed by the Communist International.

How are we to explain this increasing desire of the workers for the united front?

Since the beginning of the economic crisis, the economic conditions of the working class have worsened considerably: wages have been cut, the productivity of labor has been increased at the expense of the workers, conditions of work in the factories have been worsened, at the same time, the net profits of the big concerns and trusts have grown to a colossal extent. Unemployment has, in the main, not changed, and has become chronic. Unemployment insurance has been reduced in those countries where it exists at all. In the remaining countries, the insignificant assistance to the unemployed, afforded previously by benevolent societies, has been reduced or stopped entirely. In all the capitalist countries the elementary political rights of the workers are either entirely abolished (in the fascist countries) or are being curtailed.

The worsening of their political and economic position has affected the broadest masses of workers. Consequently, of late the desire for trade union unity and the united front of struggle has increased also among the workers belonging to the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals.

The Communist International made a proposal to the Socialist Labor International to celebrate May First jointly. The Second International rejected this proposal.

A deep crisis is taking place inside the Second International.

In several countries (France, Spain, Austria) the Social-Democratic Parties, under the influence of their members, have been compelled to set up a united front with the Communist Parties.

In those countries where the Social-Democratic Parties have held the reins of power (the Labor Party in England), or are in the government (the Social-Democratic Parties of Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Sweden), the Social-Democratic Parties are definitely against the united front of struggle, for this struggle must be directed against the governments which they are leading or of which they are members. And these governments pursue the policy of the bourgeoisie. The Swedish, Danish and Norwegian Social-Democratic governments, besides giving big grants to factory owners, landlords and bankers, have actually abolished the right to strike and are introducing a law making the trade unions financially responsible for strikes (in Denmark, the court has already awarded costs to the extent of 20,000 Danish kronen against the seamen's union for their strike). They have reduced wages, increased the prices of foodstuffs and articles of universal consumption, reinforced the police and increased expenditure on armaments. The Social-Democratic ministers in Belgium and Czechoslovakia are doing the same. Some of the parties of the Second International, under the pressure of their members, are in favor of the united front, the other parties of the Second International, which are in the governments, are against the united front. Therefore the leaders of the Second International are not in a position to issue a decision either for or against the united front at present without increasing the crisis inside the Second International. When, on March 5, 1933, the Comintern advised its section to make proposals to the Social-Democratic Parties for joint struggle against fascism, the Second International forbade its sections to accept the proposal, giving as its motive the line that the united front must be established on an international scale. When in October, 1934, the Comintern made a proposal to the Second International to form a united front on an international scale to help the Spanish fighters, the leaders of the Second International rejected the proposal, declaring at the time that it is the business of the individual parties affiliated to the Second International.

The same reply was given by the leaders of the Second International in connection with the Comintern proposal to celebrate May First jointly.

OF WHAT IMPORTANCE IS THE UNITED FRONT?

If the workers—members of the parties of the Second International—fight together with the Communists, will the working class as a whole gain thereby?

Of course they will. If the Socialist leaders refuse to make a united front, the Communists will appeal to the national parties of the Second International, and if they refuse, then to the local organizations, and, if

they in their turn refuse, then to the members of the Social-Democratic organizations, and will establish the united front over the heads of the Social-Democratic leaders and this in turn, will not fail to compel some of the obstinate Social-Democratic Party officials to give up their policy of openly breaking the united front. Thus the workers will be shown in actual practice that only the revolutionary road of struggle leads to victory. In conducting the united front, the Communists have an opportunity of drawing into the struggle strata of the workers whom the reformists have been holding back from the struggle. This is very important for the further struggle of the proletariat and for increasing the influence of the Communist Party over the masses.

Connected with the question of the united front, there is the *question of trade union unity*. Our Red trade unions are fighting for unity and meeting with stubborn resistance on the part of the reformists. A short time ago the Profintern made a proposal to the Amsterdam International to organize a joint demonstration on May First, to assist in unifying the trade unions in Spain and in France, in restoring the German trade unions destroyed by fascism, and in beginning negotiations for trade union unity on an international scale. The reply received was in the negative. In spite of this, the question of uniting the trade unions is on the order of the day, and the Communists will urge it forward and try to get it solved quickly, because only the bourgeoisie stand to gain by the split in the trade union movement.

If the trade unions unite, the revolutionary workers will have an opportunity of fighting inside them for their own proposals. In so far as the members of the reformist trade unions undoubtedly are disillusioned in the former policy of their leaders, it will be easier for the revolutionary workers by their tireless efforts to direct the trade unions along the road of the class struggle.

AGAINST FASCISM, AGAINST THE CAPITALIST OFFENSIVE.
AGAINST WAR AND IN DEFENSE OF THE U.S.S.R.

The development of events is proceeding along the lines laid down and foretold in the works of our leaders, Lenin and Stalin, in the leading documents of the Comintern.

The special kind of depression is not solving a single one of the contradictions sharpened by the economic crisis, in the throes of which the capitalist world is grappling today.

The consciousness of instability, alarm as to what tomorrow will bring, is characteristic of the mood of the leading upper strata of capitalism. The financial magnates are seizing upon the bloodstained weapon of fascism, they are preparing a new world bloodbath, they are seeking a way out in crazy, adventurist plans for attacking the U.S.S.R.

The special kind of depression does not lessen the contradictions between classes and states. "The world is squarely approaching a new round of revolutions and wars" (Theses of the Thirteenth E.C.C.I. Plenum). The world is on the eve of revolutionary battles against war, against fascism, against capitalist dictatorship and for proletarian dictatorship.

And in these battles, the land that is victoriously building socialism, the mighty socialist fatherland of the working class of the whole world, shines out as the guiding star of the world proletariat. Each of its achievements, every new factory, every new victory in mastering new technique, in raising the productivity of labor and in building the new socialist culture, is of ever greater decisive international importance.

The Derby Conference of the Independent Labor Party

By HARRY POLLITT

IN considering the results of the Forty-third Conference of the Independent Labor Party held at Derby from April 20 to 23, it is perhaps useful and necessary to recall a few facts in regard to the role and evolution of the I.L.P. to its present position.

Prior to the Special Conference of the I.L.P. at Bradford in July, 1932, the I.L.P. had been for 40 years the leaders of reformism, and of the fight against Marxism in the working class movement.

It was the I.L.P. which was responsible for placing MacDonald in the position of Parliamentary leader of the Labor Party, and of becoming Labor first Prime Minister, after which he promptly wiped his feet upon the I.L.P.

But the experiences of the general strike, two Labor governments, and the crisis in 1931, produced great changes among the I.L.P. membership, and at the special Bradford Conference in July, 1932, by 241 votes to 142, it was decided to disaffiliate from the Labor Party.

The minority promptly left the I.L.P. and formed the Socialist League, which continues the traditional I.L.P. role in the working class movement, under a pseudo-Marxist cloak.

The main cause of the disaffiliation policy carried out at Bradford was not on basic differences of policy, but disagreement over the Standing Orders of the Parliamentary Labor Party group, which sought to impose a rigid discipline on all its affiliated sections. The I.L.P., in view of the growing disillusionment of the workers with the policy of the National Government, sought to retain the advantages of association with the Labor Party, without disadvantages arising from the practical operation of Labor Party policy. We shall see later in this article that this question of the Standing Orders of the Labor Party is still playing its part in I.L.P. policy, and will in its relations with the Socialist League assume some importance regarding future development between the I.L.P. and the Socialist League.

After the Bradford Conference a new program was adopted, and almost overnight the world was informed that the I.L.P. had been transformed into a "revolutionary Marxist Party".

The step taken at that time was of great historical importance because of the previous role of the I.L.P. and, while appreciating this, it was also necessary to make the sharpest distinction between the genuine advance of the membership of the I.L.P. who were approaching towards Marxism and Communism, and the I.L.P. leaders, who, after a lifetime spent in preaching reformism and opposing Marxism and practising every kind of reformist deception and trickery, under the pressure of their own members and by the force of circumstances, suddenly proclaimed their conversion to Marxism.

It soon became clear that the "Marxism" only meant a means of maneuvering to stem the advance of the members of the I.L.P. to Communism, and for the slandering of the Soviet Union and the Communist International. The events since July, 1932, culminating in the Derby Conference of April, 1935, have fully justified the analysis of the situation that was then made by the Communist Party of Great Britain.

At the Derby Conference held in 1933, the fight between the revolutionary members of the I.L.P. and the majority of the I.L.P. leaders became sharper. Important decisions were taken at this conference against the opposition of the leaders and delegates associated with the Right wing, who were still strongly entrenched within the I.L.P. The Conference saw the need for developing mass activity and making a sharper break with purely parliamentary methods of struggle, it realized the united front was the central task, it broke off association with the Second International, and decided to approach the Communist International with a view of close cooperation.

These developments were the danger signal to the I.L.P. leaders, and from that time on the fight sharpened in the attempt to prevent any further real attempts to develop the united front on the basis of day-to-day mass activity with the Communist Party and for real effective cooperation with the C.I. because it was realized that if these two decisive tasks were carried out, the logic of the position would be a single revolutionary party in Britain affiliated to the Communist International.

But it needs to be said that at this Derby Conference, the revolutionary implications on the main questions, and especially on the question of the Communist International, were blurred over, which provided the opportunities and excuses the leaders desired in order to impede any further progress in the development of the policy and influence of those sections of their membership who were associated with the Revolutionary Policy Committee.

The same revolutionary ferment was also expressing itself within the I.L.P. Guild of Youth, who were also in favor of a working agreement with the Young Communist International.

The Communist Party and the Communist International warmly welcomed the Derby decisions, and in a letter sent to the I.L.P. by the Political Secretariat of the C.I. it was declared:

"The unity of all the revolutionary proletarian forces in Great Britain on the basis of irreconcilable class struggle, upon which the program and tactic of the Communist International is founded, would be a turning point in the history of the British labor movement and would open up an international perspective for the revolutionary workers of the I.L.P."

This great aim, however, was the very last thing that either the open Right leaders led by Sandham, or the "Left" leaders led by Maxton and Brockway desired. The Revolutionary Policy Committee, however, openly stated after the receipt of this letter from the C.I.:

"The C.I. had responded to the resolution passed at Derby, in a most friendly and conciliatory way. We must redouble our efforts to see that no unnecessary barrier is raised against

this great advance towards international revolutionary unity."
(R.P.C. *Bulletin*, No. 9, 1933.)

The majority of the I.L.P. leaders certainly redoubled their activities to prevent any further advance to Communism without a corresponding consistent drive through the I.L.P. as a whole, especially in Scotland where it was most needed on the part of the revolutionary members of the I.L.P. By the time the York Conference of the I.L.P. took place in 1934, the three distinct political lines within the I.L.P. had become plain to every observer. The open Right-wing group who were against the united front and against any cooperation with the Communist International, the dominating group led by Maxton and Brockway who tried to occupy a center position and based their policy on that of the seven "Left" Socialist Parties, the members around the Revolutionary Policy Committee who were fighting for the united front, and those of the Affiliation Committee who were for sympathetic affiliation to the C.I.

After the York Conference, there was a further split in the I.L.P., and those members and branches who were under the leadership of Sandham and Murray formed the Independent Socialist Party, whose main center is in Lancashire, but which is a very small and ineffective organization.

Again the issues became clearer and the fight between the leadership and revolutionary membership intensified. Two members of the Affiliation Committee who were campaigning for the I.L.P. becoming an organization sympathetically affiliated to the C.I. were expelled. At the same time, the leaders welcomed the formation of an avowed Trotskyist group within the I.L.P. to spread the type of political confusion and slander against the Soviet Union and the C.I. that would be useful to the Maxton-Brockway group in their efforts to retard the growth of revolutionary influence within the I.L.P., moving towards Communism.

The I.L.P. Guild of Youth, at its conference in Norwich in the summer of 1934, recorded a decision for sympathetic affiliation to the Young Communist International in spite of the opposition of the I.L.D. leaders. The National Administrative Council of the I.L.P. then called a special conference of the Guild of Youth with Brockway as its representative to try and intimidate the Guild to rescind its decision. This was held in November, 1934, but again the Guild of Youth reaffirmed its decision for sympathetic affiliation to the Young Communist International.

And from this time it is easy to see the determination of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. to stop any further flirtations with Communism, and to lay aside the mask of platonic friendship that had on so many occasions been used to deceive their members and hide their real aims and policy.

It is here necessary to review briefly what have been the experiences in the united-front activity that has been carried on between the I.L.P. and the Communist Party since 1933. Without question there are many successes to record, and important achievements to register. In the fight against the National Government and employers, in the fight against fascism and war, great activity has been carried out by the two parties, and considerable sections of workers in the trade unions, Labor Party and Cooperative Guilds have been drawn into this work.

But the outstanding weakness of the united-front campaign has

been that it has all the time been limited to certain specific campaigns and not based upon daily joint mass activity in the factories, trade unions and working class localities. This has been due to the fact that within the I.L.P. leadership there was opposition to any form of united front with the Communist Party, on the one hand, and to the fear that the I.L.P. would tend to lose its independent identity in the united front, on the other.

The practical result of this has been that the I.L.P. as a whole has never been fully mobilized for united activity. Only in London, Glasgow and certain parts of the Midlands has any sort of sustained joint activity been carried out.

Mistakes of a petty and isolated character have been made by some of our Communist locals which have been magnified out of all proportion by those I.L.P. leaders, who have been more interested in exploiting them in order to break the united front than seriously to try to overcome political causes which have given rise to them.

The fight between the I.L.P. and the C.P. in the Merthyr by-election also added to the existing difficulties in any further development of united front activity, and every effort must be made in the future to avoid rival candidates in the elections.

The main drive and mobilization of the workers through united-front activity in order to develop a mass movement with its main basis and support in the factories, trade unions and streets have come from the Communist Party. Practically every proposal for mass work and suggestions for concrete demands and forms of mass activity has had to be made by the Communist Party. It has in this respect been a one-sided partnership. The proposals for united-front activity have come from the Communist Party, the complaints arising out of this have come from the I.L.P. leaders. In addition to which, there have been strong tendencies, particularly expressed by Campbell Stephen, for the limitation of the united front to platform meetings and occasional demonstrations.

After the decision of the I.L.P. Guild of Youth, last November, to continue their association with the Y.C.I., our Central Committee received a letter from the I.L.P. demanding a new united-front agreement similar to the one existing between the French Socialist Party and the Communist Party of France.

We expressed our willingness to meet the I.L.P. representatives but we also sent them a concrete proposal for a joint national conference to discuss the unification of the I.L.P. and the Communist Party into a united Communist Party.

Subsequently a meeting of representatives of the I.L.P. and C.P. was held. Many questions were discussed, and we at once agreed to a new united-front agreement on the lines of the French one, provided it also contained a clause pledging both parties to repress any weaknesses in the work of the parties in carrying out the united-front agreement. Since then many difficulties and differences have been cleared up, and this year has undoubtedly seen many improvements in the carrying out of united-front campaigns, especially in the fight against Part 2 of the new Unemployment Act.

Of course, mistakes and weaknesses were made by both sides but nothing that good will and discussion could not have cleared up, but these mistakes, taking place on the eve of the Annual Conference of the I.L.P., were the very thing certain of the I.L.P. leaders wanted not only to oppose the whole aim and purpose of the united front, but as demagogic weapons for use against the perspective for complete unification and the formation of a united Communist Party.

At our recent Thirteenth Party Congress, special attention was given to the question of the I.L.P. Maxton attended our Congress as fraternal delegate from the I.L.P. The proposal for a Unity Conference between the two parties was enthusiastically endorsed and the declared policy of our Congress, that of doing everything possible to strengthen the fraternal relations between the two parties and the early realization of a single revolutionary party, was welcomed and supported by every delegate at the Party Congress.

Before and since our Party Congress, the Party has been making great progress. Over 2,000 new members, big increase of the Party in the trade unions, increase in the sale of the *Daily Worker*, 10,000 copies of the Congress resolution, and 40,000 copies of *Soviet Britain* sold. These facts together with the success in the Urban Council elections, especially in South Wales, have not escaped the notice of either the I. L. P. leaders or members. They are in such marked contrast to the well-known facts of the steady decline in I.L.P. membership and influence.

This contrast has played an important part in the I.L.P. before and during their annual conference. At rock bottom it is these facts which rouse the wrath and anger of the McGoverns and lead to the old Tory diehard propaganda of "Moscow gold" and anti-Soviet slander being let loose to the full applause of the yellow press and the disgust of the more far-seeing and thoughtful members of the I.L.P.

What, of course, lies behind this resurrection of Lord Banbury's anti-Soviet propaganda, is the desire for an international in which the C.P.S.U. would have no place, and whatever the I.L.P. leaders say now to the contrary, it is becoming crystal clear that behind all their talk about "revolutionary unification of all international groupings", it means ultimately a return to the Second International.

In preparation for their last Derby Conference, the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. had prepared a statement of policy. We doubt if in the history of any serious working class political party any policy statement has been issued by the leadership to which there had been presented so many amendments. But the main thing in this regard that has to be noted is that no amendments came from Glasgow, the only place in the country where the I.L.P. today has any numerical strength and influence. This placed the N.A.C. in a very strong position for carrying through their political line. What was that line?

1. To limit the united front to specific issues and no day-to-day mass joint activity.
2. To prevent any unification of the I.L.P. and the C.P. in a single revolutionary party.
3. To attack the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

4. To retain association with the seven "Left" Parties, as the best means of continuing the struggle against the Communist International.

5. To sidetrack the conference by the perspective of a new workers' party, which will turn out to be the means of effecting a return for the Labor Party.

There is no need in this article to go into any detailed analysis of the N.A.C. statement of policy that is already being prepared in the light of the amended version that came out of the Congress. It will be enough to quote the opinions of the I.L.P. members themselves to show what this statement represents.

In the Bulletin of the Revolutionary Policy Committee, issued in connection with the Derby Conference, it states in reference to the policy statement as a whole:

"This is the only comprehensive Policy Statement issued by the N.A.C. since 1933, and we might therefore expect that such a statement would show a careful analysis of the present situation, arising from an understanding of the fundamentals that form the basis of what is often rather loosely termed revolutionary theory.

"These fundamentals involve an understanding of the nature of capitalist production, the nature of State power and the function of the State institutions, the process of the class struggle; the role of the working class and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the relation of the revolutionary party to the working class and its task in the Revolution.

"It is no exaggeration to say that in all these respects the document shows that the N.A.C. is content consciously or unconsciously to appear hopelessly muddled, and so quite unable to answer the questions it poses." (*Revolutionary Committee Bulletin*, April, 1935.)

There is no point in adding anything to this criticism. The whole character of the discussion bore out the correctness of this I.L.P. criticism of the I.L.P. leaders. To watch the antics of a few Trotskyists, not one of whom has a vestige of influence in any working class organization in the country, and to see how the I.L.P. leaders were joyous at others doing their dirty work was an interesting study of that often lauded theme about "the I.L.P. Mind and Spirit".

But, of course, it was on the peace policy of the Soviet Union that the leaders and their supporters had their field day, a field day in which the coming months will reveal how much they have lost. After a few paragraphs in the policy statement on "The Danger of War", "Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union", "Class Struggle Must Go On", we come to a paragraph which is headed, "Defense of the Soviet Union" and read as follows:

"At the same time revolutionary Socialists must not be deterred from rallying to the defense of Soviet Russia if threatened with attack. The Soviet Union is the Socialist citadel in a hostile capitalist world, and must be defended at all costs."

But already flushed with their "victories" over the revolutionary delegates and so dizzy with success, the N.A.C. proudly announced their

withdrawal of the sentence, "The Soviet Union is the Socialist citadel in a hostile capitalist world and must be defended at all costs". No wonder that the delegate Hilda Vernon declared this as "extremely significant".

"Why", she asked, "has the sentence been withdrawn, a sentence representing the view we have held of the U.S.S.R. since 1917?"

Comrade Hilda Vernon had already supplied the answer to her own question in her article written before the Derby Conference, where in dealing with Brockway's notorious anti-Soviet article, she had declared:

"Why does Fenner Brockway find it necessary always to be criticizing the Soviet Union—always finding some fault to magnify for the edification of the workers of this country?

"We believe that it is because Brockway by reason of his bitter hatred of the C.I. and the C.P.G.B. has allowed his judgment to become warped on any matter that, if dealt with in a more friendly way, would bring the party closer to the C.I. and the C.P.G.B. and further away from the 'Left' revolutionization of Brockway's friends of the resisters' international and 'Left'-Trotskyist-Bureau."

"The recent articles in the *New Leader* by Fenner Brockway on the Soviet Union now display clearly the attitude that will be forced onto the party as a result of its relations with the Paris Bureau.

"We cannot allow the I.L.P. to be drawn into becoming a predominantly anti-Communist, anti-Soviet Union organization, under the disguise of the honest Socialist having to answer the honest doubts of the workers. This attitude does not answer them—it feeds them and soon may be in the position of creating them." (*Revolutionary Policy Committee Bulletin*, April, 1935.)

It is always a favorable trick of the I.L.P. leaders to compare the democracy of the I.L.P. with the terrible dictatorial methods of the Communist Party, but it appears that when Comrade Jack Gaster, one of the Revolution Policy Committee leaders and a member of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P., wrote an article criticizing Brockway's anti-Soviet line in the *New Leader* of April 5, this article was rejected on the grounds:

"Comrade Gaster's article would be interpreted inside and outside the Party as opposition to the line [contained in Brockway's article on April 5 and the *Leader* of April 12] which the Inner E.C. has endorsed." (*Revolutionary Policy Committee Bulletin*, April, 1935.)

There was nothing the majority of the I.L.P. leaders would not do to ensure Brockway's line being considered. Some comment was made that Brockway was silent at the Conference on what is looked upon as his special preserves. We understand this modesty was to prove to the I.L.P., that the N.A.C. was behind him. They certainly proved it as far as the majority of the leaders were concerned.

We have heard some remarks about some of the anti-Soviet ex-

pressions used by McGovern and Campbell Stephens as, "unfortunate but made in the heat of the moment". Not at all, the position was exquisitely explained by Maxton who, faced with angry delegates demanding to know if the statements made by McGovern and Stephens expressed the opinions of the N.A.C., declared in the famous Maxton manner, "he wished they would be as discreet as himself". So it is clear from the Chairman of the I.L.P. that what is blurred out by some I.L.P. leaders is in the thoughts of the majority.

We believe, however, that the resolution put forward by the Derby branch of the I.L.P., in relation to the Soviet Union, more correctly expresses the views of the I.L.P. membership as a whole even though it was defeated. This resolution reads as follows:

"This Conference congratulates the U.S.S.R. on its tremendous achievements in the sphere of socialist planning and construction. The Conference is of the opinion that if the Soviet Union is given the opportunity to continue its work without interruption by capitalist aggression it will soon achieve a classless order of society. The Conference welcomes the peace policy pursued by the Soviet Union and recognizes that such a policy is in the best interests of the working class throughout the world.

"We regret that the forces of the working class throughout the world are not as yet prepared for vital struggle. We realize, therefore, that the Soviet Union's policy allows for more time for the preparation and consolidation of the working class forces.

"Finally, this Conference notes that at the same time as socialist construction is increasing, capitalist decay is increasing. Therefore, with every month, the U.S.S.R. has for construction, the strength of the socialist movement is increasing not only in Russia, but throughout the world."

The above accurately reflects the views of the vast majority of the British working class, and we have no doubt at all that there will be a strong movement inside the I.L.P. against the vicious anti-Soviet policy that their leaders managed to get adopted at Derby. All the fancy phrases and beating of breasts by Jennie Lee on behalf of the N.A.C. about how they will defend the Soviet Union cannot hide the fact that at Derby the majority of the N.A.C. were playing the game of the counter-revolutionaries, a game which has for its object the destruction of the Soviet Union. But they will fail, because the British workers and all that is best in the I.L.P. are solid behind the Soviet Union, and welcome its peace policy as the greatest contribution to preventing war in our time.

I was present at the Derby Conference as a fraternal delegate of the Communist Party. It needs to be explained that I was allowed only ten minutes to convey the message of the Communist Party, and had to do so immediately the Conference opened. In the course of my speech I stated:

"The Thirteenth Congress of the Communist Party deputed me to carry to the Forty-third Conference of the Independent Labor Party warmest fraternal greetings and to express the hope that within a short space of time the complete unification of our two parties will be realized.

"For the first time in the history of either the I.L.P. or the Communist Party, this year has seen an exchange of fraternal delegates at our respective party congresses. It is both an indication of the changed economic and political situation, and of the relations between the two parties arising from this.

"We believe that the united-front activity that has been carried out between the I.L.P. and the Communist Party is of historic importance, not only because of what has been achieved through this for the British workers, but the effect it has had throughout the international labor movement.

"It was perhaps inevitable that in view of our previous relations, there should have been certain shortcomings and weaknesses in our joint work but we should set ourselves to overcome them. However, really big things have been accomplished and a new hope given to large sections of the British working class movement. Whatever differences, distrust and suspicion there may have been, whatever political differences on fundamental questions of revolutionary theory and practice have existed, our joint activity in support of the German, Austrian and Spanish workers, the Great Hunger March and the National Congress of 1934, the militant fight against war and fascism, especially the successful mass struggles against Mosley's Blackshirts, the mass fight against Part 2 of the Unemployment Act, these are great achievements which have rallied tens of thousands of workers into united activity, and had a profound effect inside the trade unions, the Labor Party and the Socialist League and Labor League of Youth as the growing opposition to the official policy within these organizations proves.

"But, because of the grave character of the present situation at home and abroad, we cannot be satisfied with these undoubted achievements. There are still millions of workers under the influence of the reformist leaders, and who have not yet been drawn into active participation in the united front.

"The British Labor leaders today are the chief opponents of the united front, both on a national and international scale. They have opposed the acceptance of the appeal for united action made by the Communist International to the Second International. They have opposed the appeal for international trade-union unity made by the Red International of Labor Unions to the International Federation of Trade Unions. They are opposed to any form of class struggle that undermines their avowed policy of class cooperation, and unless we can break down this resistance by our consistent day-to-day activity in the factories, trade unions and working class localities by our joint activity, continually drawing in wider sections of their rank and file, the British working class may experience serious setbacks and defeats.

"The Communist Party is confident that we can win the workers in the Labor Party, trade unions, and cooperatives, and in so doing force their leaders to change their present opposition to the united front.

"The fighting united front of the working class can only have real meaning if it is developed as a result of daily activity against the attacks of capital and against fascism and war.

"If we have a common policy on the trade unions, effective

preparation for the winning of all elective posts and for the various trade-union conferences, for the unification of the wage demands and preparations for economic struggles; a common policy for the Trades Councils, for work in the Cooperatives, for work amongst the unemployed and building up a mass N.U.W.M., by our joint fractions and panels of candidates, in all these activities we can help the employed and unemployed workers to secure great victories.

"If alongside these we can work out an agreement for an election policy, that will by our joint activity result in the return of a strong revolutionary group in the next Parliament, and help forward the growing opposition within the Labor Party itself, then a new perspective opens for the whole working class, and for our two parties.

"It strengthens the necessity for the complete unification of our two parties in a single revolutionary party. We believe this great aim transcends in importance every other issue before your present Conference. We have noted and welcomed the growing tendencies within the I.L.P. towards Communism and the Communist International.

"You all know where the Communist Party stands on this question. Our recent Thirteenth Party Congress declares:

" 'The fight for the united front, and the evermore revolutionary issues facing the working class struggles, make today more urgent than ever before the unity of all militant workers in a single revolutionary party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. With this aim in view the Communist Party has proposed to the Independent Labor Party the holding of a joint congress for the formation of a United Communist Party.'

"We believe the program and policy of the Communist International, to which our Party is proud to be affiliated, is the only one to which revolutionary workers can subscribe. We are convinced that for such workers there is no other alternative, neither is there a middle course between the Second and Third Internationals, and attempts to find one may easily result in not going forward to revolution, but back to reformism.

"The Communist International, the International created by Lenin, has for the first time in history created a world revolutionary Party, uniting and leading the activities of revolutionary workers and peasants in every country in the world. It is the International to which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is affiliated, the Party building socialist construction in a way that has resulted in the Soviet Union becoming one of the most powerful countries in the world and whose peace policy has won the unstinted support of every genuine lover of peace and hater of war, who recognizes in this peace policy the unswerving determination of the Soviet Union to prevent and retard war and thus give the workers of the world a breathing space in which to complete their preparations not only effectively to fight war, but to carry through the revolutionary struggle for power.

"The creation of a single revolutionary Party in Britain based upon the Program of the Communist International and

firmly and wholeheartedly supporting the Soviet Union, especially its peace policy, will not only result in a tremendous strengthening of the revolutionary forces in Britain, but will at once result in thousands of unattached revolutionary workers at present outside the ranks of the I.L.P. and the C.P. joining up and bringing further force and power to our United Party.

"The unity of action on immediate issues must be strengthened, in addition we believe that if joint meetings of the representatives and memberships of both parties in every area were regularly taking place, discussing not only immediate issues connected with the united front, but the fundamental revolutionary questions, associated with the development of the struggles for power, this would mark a very big advance in all phases of our current work and towards the unification of our two parties.

"The Communist Party is ready and willing to meet your representatives to discuss the practical measures to be taken to achieve this great aim—the creation of a mass United Communist Party in Britain affiliated to the Communist International."

Immediately after I had concluded, Maxton gave his Chairman's address, the only noteworthy point being where he stated:

"I cannot say that I feel as Pollitt has expressed it, that we are ready for unification of the Independent Labor Party and the Communist Party. But I do feel that already things are shaping so that the possibility of the formation of a new working class party in this land with the I.L.P. and the Communist Party as its central core is not in the far distant future, but very near to us." (Maxton, at I.L.P. Conference, April 20, 1935.)

We consider it very important that this avowed aim of creating a new Workers' Party has been made. That it is the aim of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. also is made clear in the leading article of the *New Leader* on April 26, 1935, where it states:

"It sets out to form a new Workers' Party in which all the growing revolutionary forces of the working class will be combined." (Editorial, *New Leader*, April 26, 1935.)

The "New Workers Party" is to be the red herring across the path of those who sincerely desire to see the complete unification of the whole of the revolutionary workers on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary program and policy.

There cannot be any opportunist unification. There can be no possibility of any *ad hoc* workers' party, each Party having its separate political program and policy.

The united front of struggle against the attitude of the employers and National Government, against fascism and war, provides the basis for united activity and cooperation, into which every section of the working class movement can be drawn.

The Labor Party and Socialist League have a program and policy which is one of reformism.

The Communist Party has a program and policy; it is based upon

the interests of the working class and upon the carrying through of a revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class and of Soviet Power.

Between these two clearly defined programs of reformism and revolution there is no half-way house between them. Finally, the issue before every worker is one or the other.

But false notions and illusions about the possibility of harmonizing conflicting views, of romantic revolutionizing, of uniting into a new workers' political party, various sections of workers without a clearly defined Marxist-Leninist program and policy may sound spacious and attractive, it may seem to fit in with our "peculiar British traditions and conditions" but fundamentally it is not only dangerous because it retards the advance to Communism but because it finally leads back directly into the camp of reformism.

The N.A.C. have not as yet outlined the basis and program on which the proposed new Workers Party would be established. But the whole line of the Derby Conference decisions reveals the probable approach. It is obvious that such a Workers Party would be asked to accept:

1. A program of "Left" Socialist muddleheaded reformism.
2. Opposition to the peace policy of the Soviet Union.
3. Either no International Associations at all or associations with a group of "Left" parties, largely comprised of renegades from Communism, whose false policy has been exposed by events, and who have only one common link, hatred of the Soviet Union and the Communist International.

But as the situation develops, this line will be found to be the cover for leading the I.L.P. step by step to the Labor Party. The proposal of the I.L.P. in the Perth by-election to the Labor candidate, for giving support on conditions he would oppose the existing Standing Orders of the Labor Party is no accident. The appeal of certain members of the Socialist League to I.L.P. leaders, the editorial of the *Daily Herald*, after the Derby Conference, appealing to certain sections of the I.L.P. to return to the Labor Party fold, are all intimately connected. The basis on which the Bradford Conference of the I.L.P. disaffiliated is neither forgotten nor is it likely to be an inseparable barrier for a later family reunion.

We make it clear, we are absolutely against Maxton's idea of a workers' party, which is to be the alternative to a united Communist Party. There is no place for the kind of loose workers' party comprising all sorts of affiliated organizations that Maxton has in mind. We are for a workers' party as visualized by Lenin, a party of revolutionary working men and women firmly moulded on revolutionary theory and practice, affiliated to the Communist International.

Today this Party already exists in Britain; it is the Communist Party. There is no half way house between the Labor Party and the Communist Party. There is none between the Second International and the Communist International.

The real issue before the I.L.P. is now as clear as daylight. It is either forward to revolution or back to reformism.

The majority of the N.A.C. leaders have shown where they stand.

It is now this issue which faces every member of the I.L.P. The gauntlet has been thrown down by the leaders; it has either to be challenged, exposed and fought against, otherwise there is no future before the members of the I.L.P.

It has been very revealing to note the summing up of the Derby Conference of the I.L.P. by the more responsible sections of the capitalist press. We have only space to give two views:

"The Communists would not play the I.L.P. game with the result that in 1935 Mr. McGovern got on his feet at Derby and talked about Russian gold in almost the same terms used by Lord Banbury 15 years ago.

"The I.L.P. may drag on for another year or two, but no one will bother about it any more. It is dried and done for and only the personality of Mr. Maxton gives a look of life to the bones." (*New Chronicle*, April 25, 1935.)

"This prediction of something less dignified than death was not difficult to make. We cannot but feel that among the best elements of the I.L.P., the catastrophic error of 1931 is now fully and bitterly realized. And we cherish the hope yet that they will rejoin the labor movement and give their best to it.

"The Derby Conference has made plain that there is no possibility of cooperation between the Labor Party and the members of the I.L.P. who dabble in revolutionary slogans and do not seem to know whether they are democrats or not.

"There are others than such in the I.L.P. and it is to these that we suggest that rejoining the Labor Party is the only conditions upon which the restoration of their political influence is possible. (*Daily Herald*, May 24, 1935.)

Our view is that if the revolutionary members of the I.L.P. now fearlessly face the fundamental issue that the Derby Conference has raised, which is forward to a united Communist Party affiliated to the Communist International, or decay and disintegration of the I.L.P. until finally the remnants make their peace with the Labor Party and return to the camp of reformism, there is great hope for the future.

But it means an open fight. It means closer active association with the Communist Party, joint membership meetings to discuss the fundamental questions of the revolution, utilizing the press and platform for carrying on the fight against the Derby decisions and policy.

It means making contacts all over the country by personal visitations, by gaining a mass circulation for the R.P.C. Bulletin, ending the tactical maneuvering to out-manuever those whose lifetime has been spent in parliamentary maneuvering and expediency.

Bold and open popularization of the Soviet Union, its peace policy and its role as the fortress of the world revolution. Full support for the program and policy of the Communist International and for the 21 points of the C.I.

It will be a hard struggle. Every latitude and facility will be given inside the I.L.P. to the poisonous vaporings of a few nondescript Trotskyists, but the class struggle will sharpen, the battle for a revolutionary unification will continue and will gather strength.

The members of the Revolutionary Policy Committee need to ponder

over the fact that outside London they have little influence and authority. The only mass basis of the I.L.P. is in Glasgow and that is where the future struggle lies and needs to be carried out. In the carrying out of it comrades will be amazed at the fundamentally reactionary character of the ideas propagated by some of the Glasgow leaders, the logical development of which is back to the Labor Party.

The ideological struggle within the I.L.P. has still to be fought out in Glasgow and when it is seriously undertaken not Moscow but Rome will be found to be the main obstacle towards the creation of a united revolutionary party affiliated to the Communist International. The leaders of the fight against Communism will be found to be those who, while privately holding anti-religious views, are not prepared to fight for Parliamentary and Municipal positions on a clear-cut revolutionary political line, for fear of losing the support of masses still under reactionary religious influences.

But the Communist Party too has serious responsibilities.

In the carrying out of the united front activities an end must be put to mistakes and tactics that estrange I.L.P. workers who are taking full part in the fight. We don't take part in the united front for separate Party aims, but for the strengthening of the whole working class fight. We work in comradesly association with all workers, and their organizations, aiming at a common division of work, leadership and responsibility. We also have to carry out much more effective propaganda and explanations of our Party aims and program, of the Soviet Union's peace policy, of the magnificent work being carried out by the Communist International and its affiliated sections all over the world. The members of the Communist Party should cultivate the most comradesly relations with I.L.P. members, exchanging common experiences, working together for common aims in the factories, trade union branch, and cooperative guilds, in the trades councils, and among the unemployed, political discussion on the current events, and on fundamental revolutionary questions. There is now a great wealth of revolutionary literature that can be made the basis of common study, that is invaluable in helping to explain for example the political meaning of the Derby Conference decisions. Only by such methods can we break down existing barriers, sweeping every existing suspicion and distrust and proving our sincerity, seriousness and determination, not only to strengthen the mass movement through united front activity, but of helping forward the struggle against those who stand in the way of uniting the revolutionary forces in this country into a united Communist Party affiliated to the Communist International.

Finally, I could not help contrasting the recent Thirteenth Congress of the Communist Party held in Manchester with the Derby Conference of the I.L.P.

In the former unity behind a political line—great mass experiences, life and enthusiasm, confidence and pride in the Party. In the latter—disunity, lack of faith in the working class, no clear line that unites the whole Party, no enthusiasm and no pride in the Party.

It is a difference between advancing Communism and trying to have a foot in two camps, reformism and revolution.

The New Political Bases for a Labor Party in the United States

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE Communist Party, U.S.A., has in the recent period resumed its efforts to establish a mass labor party in the United States. Its work is beginning under very favorable auspices. From the outset we must stress the point that the Communist Party is the only consistent proletarian party which the working class has. It is the vanguard which the working class of the U.S.A. began to bring forward immediately after the war. The working class can have only one such party. To transform it into a powerful mass Bolshevik Party is the basic condition for the liberation of the working class. Therefore when the Communists raise the question of a labor party they do not think of an organization to compete with or to replace the Communist Party, but of a broad mass workers' party, established on the basis of the united front between the Communists and all other workers, who accept the policy of the class struggle for their direct interests and who therefore break with the capitalist parties. Historical facts show that wide masses of the American working class have been until now unable to detach themselves politically from the two bourgeois parties and to form a mass party of their own. But, under the pressure of the deep and prolonged industrial crisis, occurring in the developing general crisis of capitalism, the situation is radically changing; in fact, it has already become so altered that one may correctly say the objective conditions for a mass labor party now exist in the United States and make such a party of profound importance for the working class.

In order to understand why the situation is at present so much more favorable to establish such a party of labor, it is necessary to first review, at least briefly, the main causes why no mass party of workers has as yet arisen in the United States.

It is a fact that mass parties of the workers first grew in those European countries where the bourgeois revolution either largely or wholly failed to give democratic rights to the workers. In such countries, notably Germany, Austria, Russia, etc., the workers, being acutely aware of their burning political grievances, early organized Socialist Parties to fight, in first line, for the democratic rights which they, the workers, so evidently lacked. In England and France, on the other hand, where the workers had more democratic rights, the mass parties of the proletariat were consequently much longer delayed in taking shape and strength.

It was in the United States, more than all other major countries, that the working class had the most extensive bourgeois democratic rights and illusions. This is the basic reason why they did not develop class consciousness and a workers' mass party. Possessing in some measure the formal rights of free press, free speech, free assembly, the right to vote and to hold every political office, the legal right to

organize unions and to strike, as well as a theoretical social equality with all other citizens, consequently, the American workers became saturated with bourgeois democratic illusions in spite of the fact that in America, as well as in other capitalist countries, these bourgeois democratic rights were used against the workers. Unlike the workers of Russia and Germany (and even of England and France), they did not feel the necessity for having a political party of their own to fight for immediate political demands. And, of course, they felt an even lesser urge to form such a party for the purpose of ultimately overthrowing capitalism. Therefore, until very recently, the Communist Party remained a small organization without wide mass influence.

In order to organize a separate mass political party it was necessary that they be conscious of a whole series of burning immediate political demands, but of these urgent needs they were not conscious. The grievances that pressed them most, and often these were very severe—chiefly long hours, low wages, bad working conditions—were mainly of an economic character. Hence, historically, the struggle of the American working class has almost always been limited to that for economic demands, and did not go beyond the bounds of simple trade unionism, which did not, however, prevent it from often being extremely bitter in character. And hence, also, for two generations all attempts to found a strong Socialist or labor party resulted in failure.

There were a number of other powerful factors that further checked and frustrated the growth of class consciousness and the political organization of the American working class. Among these were the presence of great tracts of government free land during several generations; the relatively higher wages and living standards of the proletariat in the United States than in European countries; the fact that during the rapid industrialization of the country large numbers of workers became well-to-do and some even became capitalists, thereby creating widespread petty bourgeois prosperity illusions among the proletariat; the reactionary influence of the large labor aristocracy and trade-union bureaucracy, the heterogeneous composition of the working class, etc. But the decisive factor was the lack of a popular program of concrete political demands for elementary democratic rights put forward as mass demands by the whole process of the class struggle.

It is not surprising, therefore, that during this whole period, which only now in the crisis is coming to an end, the trade unions, although they raised certain political demands, never developed a real political program. The demands they formulated were not of such a burning and urgent character that they could serve for the foundation of a labor party. The center of these demands was a defensive political struggle to prevent encroachments upon the trade unions' legal rights through court decisions on picketing, boycotts, trade restraint, etc. Aside from further scattering demands for the abolition of child labor, for factory health and safety inspection, for workmen's accident compensation and a few minor labor questions, the rest of organized labor's (A. F. of L.) so-called political program consisted mostly of a lot of haphazard petty-bourgeois measures against the trustification of industry, for currency reform, against prohibition, for immigration restriction, etc. And during

this whole period the masses themselves did not develop outside the framework of the A. F. of L. legislative program any additional major political demands, nor could the Socialist Party succeed in creating a popular mass political program that the workers would fight for, although it tried diligently for many years to do so; the Communist Party failed likewise.

To sum up in short: the basic reason why the American working class did not organize a mass powerful Socialist or Labor Party during so many years was because it was not conscious of a set of pressing immediate political demands around which it could develop a class viewpoint, and for which it felt impelled to organize its own party and to conduct a systematic and persistent political struggle. It is clear that if the absence of such a program or the absence of a mass movement for such a program hindered the establishment of a mass party prior to the general crisis of capitalism, then in the recent period it prevented the Communist Party becoming transformed into a mass party.

THE PROMOTION OF A MASS POLITICAL PROGRAM

But the deep-going and protracted industrial crisis has fundamentally changed this situation. Suffering under years-long prostration of industry, which has brought gigantic mass unemployment, starvation wages, low farm prices, ruthless trustification of industry, etc., and produced widespread poverty and pauperization of many millions, vast sections of the toiling masses have become conscious of a whole series of the most urgent political needs. These demands in sum amount to a popular political program. As yet this developing political program is somewhat scattered and unorganized, but it is real and vital and it undoubtedly can become a political base upon which to organize a mass labor party.

How did the Communist, Socialist or "progressive" elements act in past years when they tried to organize a labor party? They first formulated immediate demands such as they thought the masses *ought* to want and then they tried to get the masses to support these programs. But for many years it remained a vain task; the masses did not respond. Now, however, great masses of workers, farmers and lower petty bourgeoisie are becoming conscious of the need to advance many such political demands, and more, are showing their willingness to fight for them.

Many of these political demands have assumed the character of mass demands under the pressure of the crisis (such as those for social insurance, etc.). The demands for social insurance are new; while others (such as those dealing with hours, wages, status of trade unionism, etc.), were formerly considered simply as economic questions. Thus, not only is the American class struggle becoming in general more political, but hitherto economic demands of the workers (even local ones) are turning into national political questions.

Of the issues listed below, every one is a mass demand in a real sense. Literally millions of the impoverished masses are supporting each one, and often several of them together. Many of these demands were wholly or partially popularized by the A. F. of L.; several (unemploy-

ment insurance, Negro, fascism, war) by the Communist Party; one (old-age pensions) by the Townsend movement, etc. All of them have become acute national questions in American political life.

Among the more burning of these demands (not arranged in the order of their relative importance) are the following:

Unemployment insurance.

Unemployment relief.

Old-age pensions.

Thirty-hour week.

Relief for poor farmers.

Legalized national minimum wages.

Government recognition of the trade unions (illegalizing of company unions).

Against high cost of living (reduction of government-fixed prices).

For government building program (right to work).

Full union wages on government relief work.

Relief from growing tax burden.

Relief for small home owners.

Abolition of child labor.

Equal rights for Negroes.

Against fascism (defense of strike rights, free assembly, etc.).

Against imperialist war (indorsement of the U.S.S.R. peace policy).

All these demands (and more that could be added) have become deeply rooted among the great masses who are militantly demanding them. They are serving as the basis of the sharpening present-day American political struggle. Besides the growth of this new mass political program of immediate demands there is a general radicalization of the workers. There is a growing feeling among the toiling masses that life for them is becoming intolerable under capitalism, that the capitalist system is doomed and must be supplanted by a new social order. On all sides there is vague but militant talk of revolution. This developing mass antagonism to capitalism itself is also quite new in American history. Very probably, therefore, the coming labor party, especially if it develops first in the lower organs of the trade unions, will reflect this growing radicalism, although only in general terms, by demanding the abolition of the capitalist system.

The foregoing popular immediate demands undoubtedly constitute a sufficiently solid political platform around which to build a mass labor party. The possibility of these demands being liquidated by an easing of the industrial crisis is excluded. Even if the United States should regain the production level of 1929, which is not likely, there would still remain huge mass unemployment and mass pauperization of workers and farmers, and every one of the above-mentioned demands would remain a vital issue.

And it is also futile to expect that the bourgeoisie can or will satisfy the workers on these burning questions. Roosevelt is dabbling with most of them, trying to forestall more insistent demands by sopas and promises. But although this government is pouring out unparalleled billions for public works, unemployment relief, etc., it clearly cannot satisfy the masses, and daily their political demands grow sharper and

become the center of more acute struggle. Despite Roosevelt's billions and his demagogy, the radicalization of the American working class and large masses of poor farmers is growing at a pace unheard of in the history of the United States. And, of great significance; undoubtedly the broad, impoverished masses are steadily losing hope of securing real relief from Roosevelt or by the ending of the crisis. As a result of this, Roosevelt's influence among the masses is falling and indications of a mass breakaway from the two capitalist parties are becoming more and more obvious.

THE LABOR PARTY WILL NOT AUTOMATICALLY DEVELOP ITSELF

Thus, the basic elements are fast accumulating for a broad workers' party in the United States. Most important, there is for the first time a real mass working class political program of immediate demands taking shape; secondly, the masses, despairing of achieving this program within the two old parties, are also developing very definite signs of splitting from these parties; and, further, the trade unions have recently greatly strengthened themselves and are now in a much better position to serve as an organized basis for a labor party.

Despite these favorable developments, however, it would be the very greatest mistake to conclude that because of them a labor party in the United States is inevitable, and that all we have to do is to sit around with arms folded until it automatically takes shape. The formation of a labor party is far from being an easy task; it is safe to assume that only by the greatest struggle, especially on the part of the Communist Party, can a mass labor party be definitely established.

A severe struggle will be necessary because the bourgeoisie, which has no intention of granting the demands of the workers and poor farmers, will not sit idly by while *they* create a broad labor party to fight for these demands. Already, indeed, it is vigorously attempting to make use of these discontented masses so that they may be used for their own further enslavement. Fascism, supported by the big capitalist elements, is now growing with great rapidity in the United States. A whole crop of well-financed fascist and semi-fascist leaders, with the wildest demagogy and reckless promises, are working to confuse the discontented masses and to secure organized control over them. And, unfortunately, they are only too successful—undoubtedly millions of oppressed workers and farmers are already looking to them for leadership and organization.

The great danger consists in the fact that although the toiling masses are formulating urgent political demands and are tending to break with the two old parties, and labor party sentiment is growing, they are still not yet convinced that they should form a party of their own. In their political immaturity, they are very susceptible to fascist demagogy, and if the bourgeoisie realize that they can no longer control these masses in the old parties, they will, to forestall the organization of a labor party, very probably, through their new fascist agents and reactionary trade-union leaders, try to mislead the growing demand of the impoverished masses for a new party into a third bourgeois party, more or less fascist in character, which will be a real menace to the whole

working class. In deed, such a semi-fascist third capitalist party is now a real probability in the United States. Preliminary conferences have been held and it may take shape in the coming presidential elections of 1936.

The great present political importance of the Communist Party's labor party slogan, therefore, lies precisely in the fact that the formation of a broad mass labor party is the best way to prevent the discontented masses from falling under fascist control and also to organize these forces politically for effective working class struggle. A strong labor party can be made a great rallying ground, become the expression of the broad united front, which unites all the forces fighting against the rising wave of fascism in the United States.

In the building of an American labor party, the growing Communist Party confronts a huge task. It will have to do the bulk of the work. Upon it rests the chief responsibility of convincing the masses of the need to build a mass labor party, exploding the fascist demagoguery and of overcoming the opposition to a labor party among the reactionary trade-union leadership, of building up the necessary united front among the various labor organizations, etc. And, even more important, especially will it fall to the Communist Party to prevent the new labor party itself from falling under reactionary leadership and thus becoming an instrument of fascist reaction; and to make of it a force that will lead the workers along the road to revolutionary struggle. Hard tasks are these, and they will test all the Bolshevik strength and leadership of our Party. This indicates that the recent growth of the C.P. is also an important factor for the building of the labor party.

In this connection we must briefly remark (in so far as in this article we are only dealing with one side of the problems of the labor party) that the question of the labor party is indissolubly connected with that of the Communist Party in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. But these two questions are not identical. The resolutions of the January Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.U.S.A. clearly indicated why the C.P. which is now becoming transformed into a mass party still supports the movement for a mass labor party (help for wider masses than those who can follow the Party directly, to break with the capitalist parties, to help these masses to find the revolutionary path of struggle as distinct from social reformist compromise with the bourgeoisie). The resolution also pointed out that only the Communist Party is the consistent revolutionary class party of the proletariat.

This does not mean, however, that a labor party can be of value to the workers only if the Communists are in complete organizational control of it. On the contrary, one of the surest means of defeating the labor party movement would be to build on the basis of Communist control as an imperative condition. That would surely strip the labor party, from the outset, of its character as a mass united-front organization. The labor party must be a real united front on the political field. The labor party must be based upon the broad-mass unions, while the Communists must stimulate the unions to link up with the movement for a mass-labor party. In the given conditions in the United States, a labor party will certainly take on a militant and radical aspect, and

if our Communist Party acts energetically and intelligently (it can especially entrench itself in the lower organs of the labor party) it can acquire a very powerful and even leading influence in the new party. This will be true even though, paradoxically, it may be that if the labor party were formed by the A. F. of L. officially, our Party might not be permitted formally to affiliate nationally with it.

By campaigning vigorously for the labor party—without slackening in its strike and other activities—our Party can enormously increase its strength, prestige and leadership in the new party and in the working class generally. The situation is such that if the C.P. energetically takes up the work, local united labor tickets and labor parties with a real mass base and powerful Communist influence can certainly be launched in many of the smaller but very important industrial centers, also very probably labor parties can be organized in several states and, so rapidly are the masses on the move, even the establishment of a national labor party or a national labor ticket by the time of the presidential elections of 1936 is not out of the question. The fight for a labor party is the greatest single task now confronting the American Communist Party.

Organize the Discussion in Great Britain for the Seventh Congress of the Communist International

THE Seventh Congress of the Communist International is due to be held in the summer of this year. The preparation for this World Congress is now one of the most important questions facing all Communist Parties. "The most important question now facing all sections of the Comintern is the question of preparation for the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International" (*Communist International*, January 5, 1935).

The World Congress of the Communist International is the highest organ of the international working class. Its decisions will govern the line of fight of the working class throughout the world, and indirectly of the colonial masses, in the decisive period now opening of the fight for the World Revolution. All issues and problems in the working class movement will here receive complete treatment and working out of the line.

Effective discussion and preparation of all the issues before the World Congress, in order that every question shall be adequately treated and correct decisions reached, is now the vital concern and responsibility of all Communists. Every section of our Party, every leading committee, and every unit and cell should initiate now discussion on the issues before the World Congress, both on the international situation and line as a whole, and with special reference to the conditions of the fight against British imperialism and the experiences and problems in Britain. We should draw into the discussion also the broad strata of non-Party members who are close to us and look to the Communist International for guidance and leadership.

The last Congress of the Communist International was held in 1928. In the seven years since then, we have seen the collapse of capitalist stabilization and the far reaching effects of the great crisis and succeeding depression, the growing social and political disturbances, the advance of capitalism to fascism and the race to war, the rising struggles of the workers and the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, the crisis of Social-Democracy and advance of the united working class front. We are moving into a period of open revolutionary struggles. The central slogan of the present period is the slogan of Soviet Power. The central tactical task for the preparation of the future revolutionary struggles is the organization of the united front for the struggle against fascism, war and the capitalist offensive.

The following questions, in particular, need to be discussed throughout our Party:

1. How do we see the present stage and perspective of world capitalism? What are the tendencies of capitalist development in the fascist

countries, in Western Europe and America, in the colonial countries? What are the features of the present "special kind of depression", and to what is it leading? This analysis, worked out on a world scale, must be further developed in special relation to the economic situation in Britain.

2. What is the present stage of imperialist contradictions? What is the role of British imperialism in the preparation of the future war? What is the effect of the Soviet Union peace policy on the prospect of war? What are the tactical problems of the revolutionary line in relation to the war question in the present world situation?

This analysis requires to pay special attention to (1) British-American-Japanese relations; (2) Britain and the Soviet Union; (3) Britain and the European situation, relations to German fascism and to the question of collective security pacts. It is necessary to show how the peace policy of the Soviet Union combines with and assists the revolutionary fight against war. A clear answer must be given to the questions raised as to the revolutionary line in an imperialist war where the opposing imperialist force is a fascist country, or in the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, or where an imperialist country (for its own purposes) has an agreement with the Soviet Union.

At the same time it is necessary to discuss how to counter the war propaganda being spread among the working class from labor and open capitalist sources. In particular it is necessary to answer clearly and concretely the policy of "national defense" which is again (under various guises) beginning to be propagated among the working class.

3. What are the new problems raised by fascism? Why did fascism come to power in Germany and Austria? Why has it been able to rule so long in Italy? What are the lessons of the struggle against fascism in France and Spain?

On the question of fascism it will be essential for our Party to reach a clear estimate on the distinctive character, strength, and prospects of British fascism, possible variations of methods and stages from Germany or Italy, and the tactics of the anti-fascist fight.

4. What is the present stage of the colonial struggle, with special reference to the fight against British imperialism and the responsibilities of the British Communist Party?

Here, especially, attention needs to be given to (1) India, the Government's new constitution, the reaction among the British workers to the Indian issues, the question of Lancashire; (2) Ireland, the role of De Valera, the Irish Republicans, and the development of the Irish Communist Party; (3) African countries; (4) British imperialist role in China; (5) the work of the League against imperialism.

5. The central tactical problem of the present period is the whole group of questions associated with the development of the united front. It is essential to distinguish clearly the many types of questions involved.

(a) What is our estimate of Social-Democracy in the present period, of the crisis in Social-Democracy and in the Second International? What is the position of Social-Democracy in the countries where fascism holds power (Germany, Austria, Italy), in the countries where the menace of fascism is sharp and Social-Democracy has entered into the

united front (France, Spain), and in the countries where Social-Democracy still remains a governmental party and refuses the united front (Britain, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Scandinavian countries)? What is the strength of the new tendencies within the Social-Democratic Parties and the possibilities of winning sections of the membership and lower officials, and possibly a majority, to the united front.

(b) What is our estimate of the Left Parties which have developed outside the Second International, including the Independent Labor Party and also the Left Sections within the Social-Democratic Parties, and what should be our tactics towards them?

(c) What are our experiences of the united front in Britain: (1) with the Independent Labor Party; (2) in the development of the local united front with local labor parties and trade unions, as in the National March and the fight against the Unemployment Act, especially South Wales; (3) in the development of broad campaigns, as against the Sedition Act, fascism and war? What are the objections of honest Labor Party workers to the united front, and how do we reply to these objections?

(d) What are the special tasks of Communists within the united front, and how should we guard against the Right opportunist and "Left" sectarian danger which have been revealed in carrying out the united front tactics?

(e) What are the problems confronting us in our trade union work today? What is the general line that (1) the employers, and (2) the union leaders are pursuing in relation to the demands for wage increases? How do we meet the rationalization drive of the employers, particularly in relation to speed up and mass dismissals?

What are the forms of the rank and file movements and what are the obstacles to a more rapid development of these bodies?

What role should we try to get the trade union organizations to play in the struggle for the united front?

6. What is our estimate of the British economic political situation? What is the character of the "recovery" since the lowest level in 1932, and what are the economic prospects? What are the new tendencies in bourgeois politics, the weakening of the National Government, and the possibility of its break up or of its reconstruction, the growth of the Conservative Right Wing offensive, the significance of the Lloyd George campaign? What are the possibilities and probable character of a third Labor Government?

7. What is the present stage of the British working class movement? How have the Labor Party and the trade unions developed in the period 1928-1935? What was the significance of 1931 in the history of the Labor Party? What was the significance of the Southport Conference? Why is the Labor Party still able to hold the majority of the workers and to show a rising influence in the electoral scale? What is the effect of a Labor Government likely to be on this situation?

Further, what is the present relation of forces inside the Labor Party? What are the signs of new tendencies, such as the Socialist League, and their role? What are the signs of opposition forces in the local labor parties?

The question of the Independent Labor Party and its development since disaffiliation in 1932 is of special importance. Why has the campaign for sympathetic affiliation to the Communist International not met with a more rapid response? What is the present relation of forces? What are the prospects of a Unity Conference to realize the united Communist Party?

8. What has been the experience of the development of the Communist Party of Great Britain in the years 1928-1935? We need to trace the successive experience of the fight for the line of independent leadership, the turn to mass work, and the united front campaign. Have the tactics pursued been correct? If so, why has the Communist Party grown so slowly during this period? We need to tackle plainly and seriously the problem of the slow growth of the Communist Party up to the present, for which our delegation will be responsible to answer at the World Congress, and to bring out sharply the reasons in political weaknesses and in the methods of work, while at the same time noting the progress which has been achieved in correcting these weaknesses.

What are the main tasks of the Communist Party in Great Britain in the period now before us? What are the main weaknesses to be overcome? What is the main line to win over the majority of the workers?

9. All the problems of Party work require to be carefully reviewed, especially (a) the question of cadres and leadership; how far have we carried out the lines of the Sixth Congress and of the successive Plenum decisions? (b) the question of agitation and propaganda, including literature and the *Daily Worker*; how far have we found the lines of approach to carry out revolutionary politics to the masses of the British workers? (c) the questions of Party organization, composition of the Party, functioning of the Party units and fractions, distribution of work, drawing in of new members, realization of the role of leadership.

The above questions are only issued as a guidance for discussion. Discussion on these questions for the World Congress should be immediately initiated in all Party organs and groups. At the same time, discussion should not be overburdened by attempting to cover the entire ground in a formal mechanical fashion. It would be better to divide the questions over several successive meetings, in each group of questions concentrating on the issues *felt* as most important. Reports of conclusions reached, or points *felt* important to be raised at the World Congress, should be sent to the Central Committee for further discussion by the Central Committee and for the use of our delegation to the World Congress.

Full use should be made of the discussion material for the World Congress published in *The Communist International*, especially the international article issued for the general guidance of the discussion, entitled "From Shaken Stabilization to the Second Round of Revolutions and Wars", published in *The Communist International*, December 20, 1934.

The Economic Plan of the U. S. S. R. for the Year 1935

By A. WITTENBURG

THE socialist economy of the Soviet Union is growing from year to year at a tremendous pace. In spite of the fiercest resistance of the class enemies of the U.S.S.R., the First Five Year Plan was victoriously fulfilled in four years.

As a result of the First Five Year Plan, a base was established in the Soviet Union with which to complete the socialist reconstruction of the entire national economy. As a result of the First Five Year Plan, and on the basis of collectivization, the growth of the state farms and the introduction of machinery into agriculture, the Soviet Union has become transformed from a country whose farms were small and tiny, into a country whose agriculture is organized on the biggest scale in the world. The successes of the Party and of the Soviet Government in fulfilling the First Five-Year Plan prepared the basis for the further and still more powerful growth of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

The years 1933 and 1934, the first years of the Second Five Year Plan, have shown how successfully socialist construction is being developed in the U.S.S.R. along the lines of fulfilling the basic political tasks of the Second Five Year Plan, namely, the construction of a classless socialist society.

The collective farm system is triumphant. Social, socialist property, social labor and the defense of the socialist fatherland—all have penetrated deeply into the consciousness of the millions of the toilers in the U.S.S.R., and have become part of their flesh and blood.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of Soviets, Comrade Molotov stated that "N.E.P. Russia has become Socialist Russia". This is an undoubted fact, for the socialist order is the undivided dominant force in the national economy of the U.S.S.R. Socialist forms of economy will produce 97.5 per cent of the total income of the U.S.S.R. in the year 1935.

The economic plan for 1935 is subordinated basically to the practical fulfillment of the tasks arising from the establishment of the classless socialist society, and of the completion of the technical reconstruction of the national economy, and of a fundamental advance in the well-being of the toilers in town and country.

In 1935, the third year of the Second Five-Year Plan, this will be felt to a considerably greater extent than previously. All branches of economy and every toiler in the country, will feel how the tremendous capital investments made are beginning to be returned in the shape of material well-being and goods, how they begin to enrich the country, making it still more powerful, still more well-to-do and still more happy. The abolition of the bread cards which were introduced in 1929, the abolition of the rationing system, is a very special and characteristic feature of the year 1935. The national economy makes tremendous demands, which are continually growing, for supplies of raw

materials, fuel, and semi-manufactures, etc. The absence of certain kinds of products led to a situation where a system of rationing was introduced on these kinds of products, as with bread (though without ration cards). Soviet business managers could tell of many cases showing how great was the struggle in which the distribution of various kinds of products, required by their enterprises, took place. How many lances were shattered, for instance, when pig iron was being distributed? The successes in the metallurgical industry have led to a situation, in which the business managers have forgotten these times now. Pig iron is being produced in the U.S.S.R. to such an extent, that the conditions are being created for the passage from the rationing system to that of extensive Soviet trading in pig iron. The position was similar with regard to spare parts for agricultural machines, and it should be remembered that the shortage of these spare parts was one of the sharpest problems that arose in last year's sowing campaign. A similar situation can now be seen with regard to a number of other kinds of products, which are destined both for productive purposes and for wide consumption. In 1935, when there will be a very great increase in the production of commodities in all branches of the national economy, the shortage of these commodities gradually will be felt to a lesser and lesser degree. And in this respect the abolition of the bread cards at the beginning of the year, the abolition of the rationing system, is to a certain extent symbolical of the whole of the year 1935, which will have to raise the level of production in a number of branches of industry to such an extent, as to completely satisfy the ever-growing demands of the national economy.

The national economy of the Soviet Union is continuing its steady, victorious, onward march and unswerving advance, in the year 1935 as well, and is not reducing the pace at which development is going on, as accepted in the Second Five Year Plan. Industrial production in 1935 is to grow by 16 per cent, while agricultural production is to increase by 16.3 per cent. For the first time, the rate at which agricultural production is to grow is placed on a par with the rate at which industrial production is to grow. Hitherto agriculture has increased annually by an average of only 6.5 per cent. This, in the past, led to difficulties in connection with grain and raw materials as regards rapidly growing industry. Thus, the year 1935 is to be a year when the rate at which Socialist agriculture is to grow is to be intensified. This is one specific feature of the plan for the year 1935. The second specific feature of the year 1935 is that the rate at which the production of the means of consumption is to increase (15.8 per cent) is almost equal to the rate at which the increase in the production of means of production is to take place (16.1 per cent). Thus, the plan for the year 1935 speeds up the development of precisely those branches of economy (the light and food industries) which will ensure the satisfaction of the requirements of the toilers, of those engaged in constructing socialism, and which will ensure the fulfillment of the instructions of the Seventeenth Party Congress as regards raising the consumption of products by the end of the Second Five Year Plan, by two to three times as compared with the end of the First Five Year Plan.

If we take a look at the economic plan for the year 1935 from the quantitative point of view, it will be seen that the socialist industry of the Soviet Union whose total production for the present year has been fixed at 62,600,000,000 rubles, will take first place in Europe, and second place in the world after the U.S.A., as regards total quantity. (For purposes of comparison, the figures of production of the capitalist countries in the year 1929, the best pre-crisis year, have been utilized.) As regards the production of tractors, the U.S.S.R. is already in the first place in the world. As regards the production of agricultural machinery, the U.S.S.R. holds first place in Europe. As regards the smelting of pig iron, the Soviet Union held fifth place in the world in the year 1930, whereas now the U.S.S.R. is second only to America. As regards oil, the U.S.S.R. also has second place in the world.

HEAVY INDUSTRY IN 1935

As far back as the year 1921, when the national economy of the Soviet Union had fallen into complete decline after the lengthy and destructive imperialist war, as well as after the four years of the civil war and intervention, Lenin wrote the following:

"Large scale industry and its transfer into agriculture is the only economic basis for socialism, the only basis for carrying on a successful struggle to emancipate mankind from the yoke of capital."

At the Fourth Congress of the Comintern held in 1922, Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin) stated that unless heavy industry was saved, unless it was restored, no industry could be constructed, and without the latter "we shall perish as an independent country". Ten years ago, in his report on the Fourteenth Conference of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Stalin insistently stressed the international importance of the development of heavy industry in the Soviet Union. And later, at all the Congresses and Conferences of the Party and in its current work, the Party, its Central Committee, and Comrade Stalin paid and are continuing now to pay exceptional attention to heavy industry.

The victories achieved in heavy industry, as the result of the insistent and systematic struggle of the Party to overcome all difficulties in the way of the development of the powerful socialist industrialization of the country, are the results of the irreconcilable and decisive struggle waged against all wreckers and opportunists.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Party crushed all the Right opportunists who were opposed to developing heavy industry at a rapid pace; the Party exposed and crushed "the super-industrialists", the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, who, as is well known, slipped down into the bog of counter-revolution, and have become transformed into a White Guard band of a fascist type.

Heavy industry, united under the direction of the People's Commissariat for Heavy Industry, the pride of the Land of the Soviets, continues to advance in the year 1935 at a pace speedier than that of

all the remaining branches of the national economy. Its total production in the year 1935 is to reach 23,568,000,000 rubles, which is 19.6 per cent more than last year, while 24,900,000,000 kilowatt hours of electrical energy are to be produced, the production of coal is to be 112,200,000 tons, of oil 30,300,000 tons, of pig iron 12,500,000 tons, and of steel 11,800,000 tons.

The year 1935 is to give the national economy 20,000 combines, 92,000 automobiles, 126,700 tractors, and 1,723 locomotives. Such is the scope of heavy industry for the year 1935, and such are the indices which it must achieve, and which, judging by the successful advance in the first quarter, it will undoubtedly achieve. The results of the work of the heavy industry for the months January to April show that the plan is being more than fulfilled as regards the production of combines, super-phosphates, tractors, locomotives, light automobiles, and sulphuric acid. If these branches of industry maintain this pace, the plan for the year will without a doubt be more than fulfilled. The production of rolled steel, steel, coke and pig iron is slightly lagging. As is well known, in connection with the growing achievements in March and the growing productive capacity of the metal enterprises, the metallurgical industry was given increased tasks, which it has not yet succeeded in mastering. The production of railway wagons is lagging, the plan for which is two and one-half times what it was for last year. All branches of industry, however, are on a much higher level than they were last year.

In previous years the plan for the first quarter was usually unfulfilled, and the beginning of the year represented a period of uncertainty. In the present year, however, the economy of the Soviet Union has begun with the necessary speed and is advancing ahead in full confidence.

The level and certain advance, and the splendid successes achieved by various branches of industry, particularly by the metallurgical industry, are the results of the increase in culture in production, and the mastering of new production and of new productive power, and are the result of the fact that the workers have learned better to master the new up-to-date machinery which has been introduced very powerfully and will continue to be introduced into the economy of the Soviet Union in the year 1935.

It is true that in the Soviet Union there are still insufficient people with adequate experience necessary to "derive the maximum which could be derived out of the technique. . . . Technique manned by men who have mastered it can and should produce miracles" (Stalin).

The year 1935 is a year which will see the further technical development of the Soviet Union. The most up-to-date machines, the product of the latest scientific and technical research of Soviet and Western technical thought, are being introduced into industry.

Machines which demand a high degree of exactness and a high level of culture in production, gathered together in the course of many decades, are being produced, and in the future will be produced on an extensive basis in the Soviet Union. It is not so long since the Soviet Union began to produce automobiles. Now it is not only producing automobiles, but the plan for the year 1935 provides for a certain export

of machines. It is not so long since the Soviet Union concluded agreements for the receipt of technical aid from foreign firms. Now the Soviet Union is itself rendering technical aid to others, and with its own forces has already built a textile combine, and will build yet another, in Turkey. It is not so long since the airplane, which is the most exact product of modern technique, was something not to be achieved by Soviet industry; it is not so long since the Soviet Union imported the most vital part of the airplane, the motor. Now Soviet airplanes are in no way behind foreign airplanes, and the powerful Soviet aviation, the object of the love of the toilers of the U.S.S.R., and their pride, the bulwark of its peaceful activity, is completely the product of Soviet workers, foremen and engineers.

The Moscow underground railway, which is recognized by everybody as a splendid technical achievement, was built by Soviet workers, technicians, and engineers who have mastered the latest successes of world technique and the methods of the socialist organization of labor. Not only the toilers of the U.S.S.R., but also foreign workers and even the representatives of the foreign bourgeoisie are all amazed at the majesty of the Metro in Moscow, and all recognize that it is the best underground railway in the world.

"Foreigners who have travelled on the first Moscow underground railway are unanimously of the opinion that this railway has no equal in the world." (*New York Herald Tribune*, April 25, 1935.)

What is it that characterizes a country which is advanced technically? First, its high level of machine construction. It is precisely machine construction, which demands tremendous exactitude and a high level of technical and constructive thought, which is the first sign of an advanced country. This year the Soviet machine construction industry will produce goods amounting to 16,100,000,000 rubles, which is almost 15 times higher than the level of machine construction in Tsarist Russia (that part of it which now constitutes the U.S.S.R.), and more than one and one-half times the value of the total product of large scale industry in Tsarist Russia, and four times the level of production in 1930.

This is how the development of machine construction has taken place in the Soviet Union. In 1930, 7,100 backward and small lathes were produced. In 1934, 19,800 bigger and more powerful machines were produced. In 1935, 26,000 metal lathes have to be produced, the majority of which will be of the latest construction.

The speedy advance of machine construction is the foremost link in the reconstruction of Soviet economy, and in satisfying its varying needs as regards modern, first class machine supplies. Therefore, the production of machines in the year 1935 is to be 19.3 per cent more than the previous year, whereas the general increase of industrial production is 16 per cent as against the previous year.

Exact instruments and high quality lathes, all demand that steps be taken in industry to achieve very high class mastery of technique. The technical demands on Soviet enterprises are so high that not all

European machine construction works are capable of satisfying the needs that arise, for instance, out of the reconstruction of the "Stalin" automobile works in Moscow as regards certain types of lathes. But these lathes will be produced in the machine construction works of Moscow. Now the various enterprises are being faced with the demand that they not only fulfill the plan as regards the quantity of goods produced, but that they pay their way, and increase to a considerable degree the productivity of labor (14 per cent more than in 1935), in addition to which high quality products are asked for.

It is clear that this task cannot be fulfilled, unless steps are taken to establish what is in fact the most valuable of all, namely, the establishment of economic cadres.

"We must at last understand that of all the valuable capital in the world, the most valuable and the most decisive capital is people, cadres." (Stalin.)

In the recent years there has been a tremendous development in the Soviet Union of new proletarian forces of engineers and technicians, and of new forces of technically literate workers. The state of things which was achieved in Europe over the course of tens of years has been accomplished in the Soviet Union "in the main in three to four years" (Stalin).

The present year of 1935 will be a year which will see the further wide addition of new people, working-class people, devoted to the socialist cause, to the ranks of Soviet engineers and technicians. In the year 1935 the higher educational institutions connected with heavy industry alone are to release about 40,000 new engineers and technicians. These people have no need, as their West European colleagues have, to worry about their future, about the morrow. The economy of the Soviet Union will find work for every one of them, and will make it possible for each of them to advance as quickly as his capabilities allow him. The recent graduation of 700 engineers showed that not only Soviet industry, but also the Soviet institutions for the production of cadres, namely, the higher educational institutions, have raised the quality of their work, have raised the quality of the "products" which they issue, and are providing the national economy with engineers who have a wide theoretical education and who can satisfy the demands of growing industry.

On the eve of the introduction of the First Five-Year Plan, Comrade Stalin sharply set the question of the creation of our own proletarian forces who could master the requisite technique.

In solving this task the Soviet Government went to considerable expense, and not a few machines were damaged before the young engineers, technicians and workers mastered the technique of production. "But then we gained what was dearest, namely, time, and created what was most valuable in our economy, namely, cadres" (Stalin).

Now Comrade Stalin has faced the whole country with the task of paying careful attention to people and to the nurturing of new cadres. At the Conference held at the end of 1934, attended by leading officials in the metal industry, Comrade Stalin demanded, in the speech he made,

that special attention be paid to live people and their education. "We must pay attention and give care to the nurturing of cadres just as a gardener nurtures his favorite fruit tree" (Stalin).

And in his last speech at the graduation of students of the Red Army Academy held on May 4, 1935, Comrade Stalin once again stressed will full force the task of carefully nurturing new cadres. "Cadres decide everything"—this was the new slogan advanced by Comrade Stalin in his speech.

"The old slogan 'Technique decides everything', which is the reflection of the period gone by, when we suffered hunger in the sphere of technique, must now be replaced by a new slogan, by the slogan to the effect that 'Cadres decide everything'. This is the main thing now" (Stalin).

This new slogan is of world historic importance. It rallies the millions of the masses of the toilers of the Land of the Soviets to win new victories for socialism in the U.S.S.R., and rallies the proletariat throughout the world for the struggle to bring about the victory of the world proletarian revolution.

TASKS IN THE SPHERE OF AGRICULTURE

The plan for the year 1935 provides for a broad and further mechanization of agriculture. In the present year industry will provide agriculture with more than 112,000 tractors alone. As a result, in the year 1935, in the regions served by the State machine tractor stations, such work as the tillage of the land will be more than three-quarters mechanized. In the year 1935, the total amount of tractor work done (in terms of tillage) by the machine tractor stations alone will equal 102.5 million hectares.* Threshing will be mechanized 75 per cent and only harvesting work is to some extent backward (the harvesting of grain will be 37 per cent mechanized, of flax 34 per cent, and of sugar beet 58.7 per cent). New culture is being introduced victoriously in the methods of carrying on agricultural production. In the year gone by, 270,000 tractorists have been prepared, as well as 21,000 (field) brigade leaders, and 26,000 chauffeurs. About 500,000 field and cattle-breeding farm brigade leaders are engaged in study.

The speedy rise of mechanization in agriculture, the very great increase in the production of mineral fertilizers, the ever growing extent to which irrigation and amelioration are being introduced into agriculture, render it possible for a very significant rise in the harvest to be achieved, and this is one of the most important tasks of the Second Five Year Plan in agriculture. In the year 1935, the yield of grain is to be increased to 0.4 centners per hectare, of cotton to 9.2 centners per hectare, of flax to 3 centners, and of sugar-beet to 125 centners per hectare. A significant increase in the harvest of other cultures is already proposed. A series of alterations are proposed as regards sowing, particularly there is to be an increased amount of land

* A hectare equals approximately 2.5 acres.

sown with fodder cultures (42.2 per cent). This is linked up with the other main task facing agriculture in the year 1935, namely, with the development of cattle-breeding.

Thus in the present year, the character and pace of the reproduction of cattle assumes the force of a task firmly established by the state. In the year 1935, 2,000,000 foal, over 11,000,000 calves, about 17,000,000 pigs, and over 16,000,000 lambs are to be produced and preserved in the state farms, collective farm cattle-breeding stations, and by the collective and individual farmers privately.

Thus, by the end of 1935, the total number of horses must be increased by about 10 per cent as compared with the year 1934, and large horned cattle by about 20 per cent, cows by 6 per cent, pigs by 40 per cent, and sheep and goats by 20 per cent.

THE TASKS FACING TRANSPORT IN 1935

Tremendous tasks have been placed before transport by the plan for the year 1935. This is the most backward section of the national economy, one which has remained a brake on the development of the national economy until very recently. How many times in recent years has the work of a number of factories been worsened as the result of the unsatisfactory work of transport? At one time, an absence of raw materials, at another time the factory stores filled with products with no possibilities of getting rid of them. It is quite understandable that a tremendous quantity of the capital investments for the year 1935, about 4,000,000,000 rubles, is being invested precisely in rail transport. But with new construction, vital tasks have been set in the sphere of raising various indices in the work of transport.

Of course, the work of the railroads of the Soviet Union must not be compared with the railroads of the capitalist countries, where as the result of the crisis they are not working at full capacity, and where as the result of the capitalist system of management, they never can and never will be fully utilized. The socialist planned system makes it possible to receive far more from Soviet transport than is now being got. A decisive struggle against accidents and wrecks on the railroads, speeding up of the turnover of rail wagons, an increase in the average daily journey covered by locomotives will make it possible, with the existing material available, to make a decided increase in the railway turnover.

In his speech made at a conference of railway officials (the conference took place at the beginning of April, and Comrade Kaganovich's speech was published in the Soviet press of April 24), Comrade Kaganovich, the new People's Commissar for Railroads, declared that "the day has arrived when we can and must begin to go upwards". The first step of this movement forward and upwards can already be noted. In April, the railroads of the Soviet Union, for the first time in many years, more than fulfilled their plan for the transport of goods traffic. With the Bolshevik persistence which is part of him, Comrade Kaganovich is now insistently introducing on the railroads the Stalinist style of work and leadership. This is ensuring a decisive turn in the work

of transport this year. According to the plan for 1935, the railroads must carry 350,000,000 tons of load (an increase of 19.3 per cent), river transport must carry 59,000,000 tons of load, (an increase of 13.5 per cent), and sea transport 26,800,000 tons of load (an increase of 21.1 per cent).

This program is based on the introduction of more than 1,700 locomotives, 80,000 wagons, the introduction of automatic brakes, increasing the weight of the trains, and developing new railway lines and strengthening the old lines. Transport is now receiving the special attention of the whole country; the best people in the country are being transferred to work in transport. The development of transport is one of the most fundamental tasks of the year 1935.

NEW CONSTRUCTION IN THE YEAR 1935

What is to be built in the present year? The fact that the "parasitic classes have been liquidated" in the Soviet Union renders it possible for tremendous sums of money to be invested in new construction every year, and for tremendous resources to be gathered together. In the present year, the total amount of capital expenditure is to amount to the colossal figure of 21,200,000,000 rubles, i.e., approximately as much as was invested last year, if we judge only by figures, but actually the figure is much higher because according to plan, the value of construction is to be reduced by 15 per cent as compared with the previous year.

If we examine where these tremendous sums are being invested, and which branches receive preference, it will become clear that the Party and the government are taking tremendous care to further improve the lives of the toilers. And in actual fact, while stabilizing the total amount of expenditure on capital construction, we can note an increase in investments of 21.6 per cent on transport, 23.9 per cent in trade, and 7.9 per cent in industry producing the means of consumption. As for industry producing the means of production, the expenditure on capital construction is somewhat reduced as compared with last year, although the total amount is sufficiently large.

One detail of the plan for capital construction should be of interest. Until the present year, the Soviet Union annually expended more on construction than was the value of the new enterprises brought into operation. This was quite understandable, because hitherto we had the beginning of the great period of construction. In the present year, enterprises are being operated whose total value is equal to the sum of the new investments made. There will be 2,000 big building jobs in the course of construction, of which 150 have begun anew, whereas the remainder have come over from previous years. Five hundred and fifty construction jobs will be finished during the course of this year, and by January 1, 1936. This will increase the basic funds of the national economy to 139,500 million rubles (an increase of 15 per cent).

The new electric power stations and the new power added to the old ones will give new electric power amounting to 584,000 kilowatts,

It is proposed to undertake a wide development of new, big electric power stations in Perm, Yaroslavl, at Chirchikstroi, Sviri, and the River Chrome.

Six new blast furnaces will be set going with a total capacity of 1.8 million tons of cast iron, as well as 30 open hearth furnaces, 24 electric furnaces, one blooming mill, 22 rolling mills, and 6 pipe-rolling mills.

The Dnieper aluminum works is being completed, and the Chelyabinsk zinc works has already been completed. Construction is going ahead in connection with other light metal enterprises, such as copper mills in the Balkhash regions and the Middle Urals, aluminum plants in the Urals, aluminum works in Tikhvin, and the polymetal combine in the Altai.

Forty-one new mines will begin to operate, automobile factories are being very much extended, and a beginning is being made on the construction of new wagon and locomotive works. We could continue for a long time to quote the new construction jobs in view, each of which represents a tremendous enterprise on a world scale, built according to the very latest types and on the basis of the very latest achievements of science and technique. The heart of every toiler in the Soviet Union, and the hearts of the workers of all countries, beat faster at the thought of the tremendous scope of the construction being carried through, and at the thought of how the one-time poor, barbarous, half-savage and backward Russia has, under the *new socialist relations*, speedily leaped over the distance which separated it from the countries which were advanced technically and economically, and is climbing the heights of modern technique. Every toiler in the Soviet Union is full of pride at his wonderful country, at the marvelous successes, unheard of in human history, being achieved because every one, beginning with the unskilled laborer and ending with the engineer can say: "This is mine, it has been done for me, here is my share of the work, of what has been created! Here is my present, and here is my future!"

And the working class throughout the whole world, as it looks at the tremendous successes of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., and the self-sacrificing struggle of the toilers of the Soviet Union directed towards the construction of a classless society, can say:

"Here is my vanguard, here is my shock brigade, here is my working class state, here is my fatherland; they are promoting their cause which is our cause, well, let us support them against the capitalists and spread the cause of the world revolution."
(*Leninism*, by Stalin, p. 367.)

THE STRUGGLE TO IMPROVE THE CULTURAL AND LIVING CONDITIONS OF THE TOILERS

The proletarians and collective farmers understand quite well and feel that with every year life in the Soviet Union is becoming more satisfactory, well-to-do and cultured. The face of the country is being changed in the backward national regions, industrial cities are arising on former empty ground, and these are accustoming the peoples to the

highest culture, peoples who were formerly in the position of colonial slaves. The well-being of the collective farmers is growing, new towns are arising, and the service of the toilers is improving. In the Soviet Union unemployment has been forgotten. The total wages bill is growing from year to year. In 1935 the total wages bill is being increased by 8,100 million rubles, while the average wages have increased by 13.4 per cent. Funds for the service of culture and the living conditions of the toilers, and this, it should be borne in mind, is also a solid additional source of improving the material well-being of the toilers, are being increased to a total of 7,600 million rubles. In addition, it is proposed to bring about a considerable reduction in the price of products.

With every year that passes the collective farmers are becoming more and more well-to-do. Do those people who shriek about and slander the collective farm system know that as far back as the year 1933, the total amount of grain collected per head of the collective farm population was 10 per cent higher than in the kulak farms in the year 1929 (10.2 centners, and 9.2 centners)? And is not the fact that pregnant collective farm women are released from work and receive their pay the best proof of the rise in the well-being of the collective farms? And is not the fact that the sale in the villages of products unheard of hitherto in the villages, such as bicycles, gramophones and wireless receivers, confirmation of the extent to which comfort and culture are growing in the Soviet Union? The majority of the population are studying in one way or another, and are improving their literacy and their qualifications. In 1935, two-and-a-half million workers and collective farmers will be covered by mass voluntary technical study. Hundreds of thousands of workers are studying in circles, evening schools, universities, technical colleges, etc., while still engaged in production. In the year 1935, 10,100 million rubles will be expended on education, *i.e.*, 13.3 per cent more than last year. The task of introducing universal education in the villages within the bounds of Classes 1 to 4 has already been solved, and now the task is being solved of introducing universal compulsory polytechnical training to cover the seven-year school. In 1935, in Classes 5 to 7 there will be 20.4 per cent more than last year, in Classes 8 to 10, 108 per cent more than last year. In the high schools, technical colleges, etc., the number of students has increased to a total of 1,300,000 people. The number of clubs, reading rooms, libraries, cinemas and theatres is to increase in the year 1935.

A similar picture is to be seen as regards health protection. The number of beds in the hospitals in town and country is to be increased, as is the number of kindergartens, sanatoria, and rest homes. It is sufficient to state that in the year 1935, 895,000 workers and collective farmers will rest in various sanatoria, while 1,400,000 people will take their rest in the rest homes belonging to the All-Union Council of Trade Unions. Expenditure on health protection is to increase from 3,200 million rubles to 5,000 million rubles.



These, in general outline, are the basic features of the plan for the year 1935, these are the basic figures, These are the tasks which the

plan for 1935 places before the toilers of the Soviet Union, and this is the plan of the struggle for the reconstruction of the national economy, for the rise in production, for the alteration in the lives of the people, for culture, knowledge, mastery of technique, and for the re-making of the people, for the creation of such a level of livelihood as capitalism has never, and never can, know. It is possible only in the land where socialism is victorious, in the Soviet Union, the shock brigade of the world proletariat, the fatherland of the toilers throughout the world.

The working class of the Soviet Union is fighting against tremendous difficulties in the unceasing struggle against the class enemy, who is cunningly attempting to cover up his traces. The workers of the Soviet Union are fighting for their future. The assassination of the beloved tribune and leader of the proletariat, that splendid Bolshevik, Comrade Kirov, at the foul hand of the dregs of the Zinoviev counter-revolutionary opposition, has once again raised very sharply the question of class vigilance. The enemy has been crushed, but the remnants of the class enemy have not yet been wiped out. These enemies hide themselves wherever they can. They are the people who have recently murdered the worker Bykov, one of the authors of the book entitled "There Were High Hills", they are the people who continue to murder Pioneers who expose them, they are the people who at every step do their wrecking work as far as their strength allows them. But the wheels of history are not to be turned back; they will crush these enemies mercilessly. No power can prevent the rising working class, the victorious class, from building the new socialist society. The successes of the Soviet Union are the successes of the world proletariat. They enthuse every advanced worker in the capitalist countries for the struggle against capitalism, against fascism and war, and for the defense of the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the world proletarian revolution.

Lenin on Freedom, Democracy and Equality *

By D.

THE initiative of Martin Lawrence of London in issuing, as a pamphlet, Lenin's speech on the deception of the people by slogans of freedom and equality is certainly to be welcomed. The pamphlet deals with questions which are of actual importance today.

Take the question of freedom and democracy. In England, not only the Social-Democrats but also leading capitalist politicians like Baldwin continue demagogically to talk about the "freedom and democracy" of Great Britain, as an argument against revolution, to cover up the fascist developments taking place in England, and to slander the "dictatorship" (of the proletariat) that exists in the U.S.S.R.

In this pamphlet we meet with Lenin's treatment, in a vigorous and popular style, of these fundamental questions, summed up by him in the phrase that "freedom and democracy have hitherto been freedom and democracy for the property owners, and just crumbs from the table for those without property".

The question of the Bolshevik attitude to war, of the Soviet Union's fight for peace and of the consequent temporizings rendered necessary with the imperialist powers, making use of the contradictions between the latter, become clearer on reading this speech, especially the section dealing with the explanation of the attitude of the Bolsheviks in signing the Brest Peace forced on them by predatory German imperialism in 1918.

But this speech is famous, and justly famous, for its popular explanation of the Leninist attitude of the working class to the peasantry, and particularly in the period after the revolution, dealing with the specific conditions existing in Soviet Russia in the year 1919.

But even the workers of England, where the peasant problem is of relatively small importance even as compared with such countries as France, Germany, etc., but in whose colonies the peasant question is of decisive importance, have thoroughly to master the lessons to be learned from the experience of the Soviet Union.

As Lenin states in this pamphlet, actually a speech made in the year 1919, "the new organization of the state is being born with the greatest difficulty, because to defeat disorganizing petty bourgeois looseness is . . . a million times more difficult than overcoming the landlord violator or the capitalist violator, but it is a million times more fruitful for the creation of a new organization free from exploitation. When proletarian organization solves this task, then socialism has won finally" (page 43).

* *Lenin On the Deception of the People by Slogans of Freedom and Equality*, published by Martin Lawrence, London.

At the present time, when the Soviet Union which, on the basis of the successes achieved by socialist industrialization and of the victory of collectivization in the countryside, has destroyed the causes giving rise to exploitation, and is closely approaching the classless socialist society, we can say that "proletarian organization" has achieved a decisive victory over "petty bourgeois looseness".

The political expression of these tremendous social advances in the U.S.S.R. can be seen in the decisions of the recent Seventh Congress of Soviets regarding the changes in the Soviet constitution which constitute a new epoch in the development of Soviet democracy.

The publication of this booklet at the present time is timely, but would have been of immensely greater value with an authoritative preface from the publishers, explaining the main problems raised in the pamphlet.

We must, however, while thus briefly referring to some of the points dealt with in Lenin's pamphlet, draw particular attention to the disgraceful way in which the pamphlet has been allowed to see the light of day in England—a phenomenon all the more surprising since the publishers, Martin Lawrence, have deservedly won a reputation for the high quality of the materials they issue.

But even a casual reading of the English translation offered to the British workers reveals a remarkable collection of mistakes, bad translations, stylistic weaknesses, careless technical editing, etc.

What, for instance, is the meaning of the following (page 24, line 11 of the pamphlet): "The bourgeois gentlemen are to blame for the delay and the bourgeois intellectual gentlemen" (the text should read "Messrs. the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals are to blame for the delay"). What are we to understand by the following (page 25, line 16): "Milyukov joked and Chernov and the followers of the newspaper *Novaya Zhizn*" (incidentally, several lines are left out of the text at this point). The text should read as follows: Milyukov, Chernov and the followers of the *Novaya Zhizn* also joked. They joked with the words: "Well, please, Messrs. Bolsheviks, form your cabinet, take power yourselves for a couple of weeks. You will help us splendidly!" This is what Chernov of the S.R.s wrote, as did Milyukov in the *Ryech* and as the semi-Menshevik *Novaya Zhizn* did. On page 31, line 1, we read: "Liebknecht is murdered, Rosa Luxemburg is murdered, all the Russian bourgeoisie are saying, this was printed . . ." A phrase without meaning due to careless editing. It should read: "Liebknecht is murdered, Rosa Luxemburg is murdered. All the Russian bourgeoisie are saying—this was printed. . . ."

What are the "necessaries of food" (page 28, line 5) and how is it that on page 35, line 6, such nonsense as "income on food" was allowed to pass the editor, whereas common sense and the Russian text refer to "expenditure on food", or how does it come about that instead of seeing the words "who scare the revolution which is commencing with the thought that it may be defeated" we read (page 39, line 4) "who are frightened of a revolution which is commencing because it may be defeated".

We could quote many cases of mistranslation (page 22 last line,

page 23, line 11 and 12, page 24 line 6, etc.), but this would take up too much space.

We must also refer to examples of stylistic weakness. Would any orator speaking English say "I declare that these people if they possess . . ." (page 19, last paragraph)—which is a literal translation of the Russian arrangement of the words—or would he say "I declare that if these people possess"? Do we speak of "freedom of meeting" (page 22), or of "freedom of assembly"—and so on. Here again there is obvious careless literary editing, added to which we meet with careless technical editing, for example, page 31, 7th line from the bottom, "that" instead of "than"; page 36, 14 lines from the bottom, "darkest of the peasants" instead of "darkness of the peasants"; page 37, 7 lines from the bottom, "it is possible" instead of "is it possible", and so on.

These are only some of the errors that there are to be found in the translation offered to the British working class. Such treatment of any ordinary author would merit condemnation, and in connection with the work of Lenin is nothing short of scandalous. The workers of Great Britain, having waited sixteen years for the translation of this pamphlet would have gladly waited a little longer so as to receive the pamphlet, translated and technically produced with the love and care which every word of our great teacher and leader, Lenin, should receive.

Finally, we would like to draw attention to the fact that International Publishers of New York have started the issue of special "Five and Ten Cent" editions (in 100,000 copies each) of Marxist-Leninist classics—Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* and Lenin's *State and Revolution* being sold at 10 cents.

Is it not possible for something similar to be tried in England? Could not the pamphlet reviewed, issued at sixpence, have been printed in a cheap though neat twopenny or threepenny edition? This is the way to facilitate mass circulation for Lenin's works. The American example has shown that it can be done.

For the Struggle Against Imperialist War

FOR AUGUST FIRST CAMPAIGN

The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists— <i>Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern</i>05
A Letter to American Workers—By V. I. Lenin03
Japanese Imperialism Stripped— <i>The Secret Memorandum of Tanaka, Premier of Japan</i>05
War in Africa—Italian Fascism Prepares to Enslave Ethiopia—By James W. Ford and Harry Gannes05
Why Fascism Leads to War—By John Strachey05
The International Situation and the Soviet Union—By V. M. Molotov03
Ready for Defense—By K. E. Voroshilov05
The Red Army (illustrated)03
Poison Gas and the Next War—By Donald A. Cameron05
Revolutionary Struggle Against War Versus Fascism—By Alex Bittelman05
From the First World War to the Second—By Nemo10
Fascism, the Danger of War, and the Tasks of the Communist Parties— <i>Report to the 13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I.</i>10
Revolutionary Crisis, Fascism and War— <i>Report to the 13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I.</i> —By D. Z. Manuilsky05
Socialism and War—By V. I. Lenin15
The War and the Second International—By V. I. Lenin20
The Toilers Against War—By Clara Zetkin20

Order from your nearest bookshop or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

CONTINUE YOUR STUDY OF COMMUNISM

In Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at
These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

- Aberdeen:** 514 E. Market St.
Akron: 365 South Main Street
Baltimore: 509 North Eutaw St.
Boston: 216 Broadway
Buffalo: 75½ W. Chippewa, R. 7
Butte: 106 West Granite St.
Camden: 501 Market St., Rm. 6
Chicago: 505 South State St.
 2135 West Division St.
 1326 East 57th St.
Cincinnati: 117 E. 12th St., 2 fl.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Dayton: 712 Wayne Ave.
Denver: 522 Exchange Bldg.
Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.
Duluth: 110 West First St.
Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.
Hartford: 88 Church St.
Los Angeles: 224 So. Spring St.
Milwaukee: 419 West State St.
Minneapolis: 241 Marquette St.
Newark: 1264 Raymond Blvd.
New Haven: 280 Park St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
 699 Prospect Ave., Bronx
 369 Sutter Ave., B'klyn
 25 Chauncey St., B'klyn
Omaha: 2404 Parker Street
Oakland: 567 12th St.
Paterson: 201 Market St.
- Philadelphia:** 46 N. 8th St. 2d fl.
 118 W. Allegheny Ave.
 4023 Gerard Ave.
 2404 Ridge Ave.
Pittsburgh: 1638 Fifth Ave.
Portland: 64 Alder St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St.
 Room 43
Reading: 224 North Ninth
Sacramento: 1018 Fifth St.
St. Louis: 3528 Franklin Ave.
Salt Lake City: 415 Hooper Bldg.
San Diego: 852 Eighth Ave.
San Francisco: 37 Grove St.
 1168 Golden Gate Ave.
 542 Valencia St.
 121 Haight St.
Santa Barbara: 208 W. Canon
 Perdido
Seattle: 614½ First Av., Rm. 13
 4226 University Way
 24th and Russell St.
Sioux Falls, S. D.: 223 E. 8th St.
Spokane: 218 Washington St.,
 Room 14
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D. C.:
 513 F. St., N. W.
Youngstown:
 310 W. Federal St., 3rd fl.

Write for a complete catalog to the nearest of the
above addresses or to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City